

# THE CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM

*A National Quarterly Magazine*

VOLUME 7, No. 1

FALL, 1948



## *Contents*

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND PALESTINE	- - - - -	Jacob Freid	1
JEWISH YOUTH RENASCENT	- - - - -	Charles G. Spiegler	8
AT THE SCALE— <i>A Woodcut</i>	- - - - -	Isac Friedlander	13
NIGHTMARES OF AN OLD PRISONER	- - - - -	Ben Halpern	14
ISRAEL— <i>A Poem</i>	- - - - -	Selwyn S. Schwartz	22
AFTER RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS . . .	- - - - -	Stanley Mosk	23
ROBERT MORSS LOVETT	- - - - -	Carl Grabo	28
ROTHSCHILD	- - - - -	Mortimer Levitt	35
ZOLA AND THE DREYFUS CASE	- - - - -	S. L. Shneiderman	39
VOICE OF THE HAGANAH— <i>A Poem</i>	- - - - -	Judah M. Turkat	42
SONG OF THE HAGANAH— <i>A Poem</i>	- - - - -	Judah M. Turkat	42
PRINCIPLES FOR JEWISH CENTERS	- - - - -	Werner J. Cahnman	43
INTERCEPTED— <i>A Woodcut</i>	- - - - -	Isac Friedlander	48
MIDWESTERN COMMENTARY	- - - - -	Elmer Gertz	49
NEW YORK NOTES	- - - - -	Vero	55
WASHINGTON NOTES	- - - - -	Murray Frank	60
WEST COAST LETTER	- - - - -	Carey McWilliams	65
BOOK REVIEWS	- - - - -		70-83
AT THE ARK— <i>Dry Point Etching</i>	- - - - -	N. P. Steinberg	84

BENJAMIN WEINTROUB, *Editor and Publisher*

ALFRED WERNER, *Associate Editor*

---

THE CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM is published quarterly at 82 W. Washington St., Chicago 2, Ill. Copyright, 1948, in the U.S.A. by Benjamin Weintroub, Publisher. Entered as second-class matter Jan. 19, 1943, at the post-office at Chicago, Ill., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelope. Subscription: \$5.00 per year.

## Contributors to this Issue

**BERNARD M. BASS**—Is teaching at Ohio State University while working toward a Ph. D. in the Department of Psychology.

**WERNER J. CAHNMAN**—Formerly with Fisk University, is a well-known writer in the field of Sociology.

**JACOB FREID**—Formerly with our State Department, is now editor of the Jewish Affairs Pamphlets of the American Jewish Congress. He has taught Sociology at the New School for Social Research.

**ISAC FRIEDLANDER**—Is a New York artist of national reputation. His work appears in a number of galleries in the United States and Canada.

**CHARLES I. GLICKSBERG**—Is assistant professor of English at Brooklyn College, New York, and the author of *Walt Whitman and the Civil War*.

**CARL GRABO**—Professor-emeritus, University of Chicago, is the author of *The Creative Critic*, recently published.

**FELIKS GROSS**—Is visiting professor, Graduate School of Arts and Science, New York University.

**BEN HALPERN**—Is the managing editor of the *Jewish Frontier*.

**MORTIMER LEVITT**—Is a reporter for the *Chronicle Telegraph* in Quebec City, Canada.

**STANLEY MOSK**—Is Judge of the Superior Court, Los Angeles, California.

**SAMUEL MOSS**—A Chicagoan, is co-author with his brother Sidney, of a novel, entitled *Thy Men Shall Fall*, which will be published this Autumn by Ziff-Davis Publishing Co.

**JOSEPH SLABEY ROUCEK**—Is professor of Political Science and Sociology at the University of Bridgeport. He is, in collaboration with Francis J. Brown, the author of *One America*, a history of contributions and present problems of our racial and national minorities.

**SELWYN S. SCHWARTZ**—Is the author of *Preface to Maturity*, *Poet in Blue Minor*, and other works of poetry.

**S. L. SHNEIDERMAN**—Is the foreign editor of the *Jewish Morning Journal* and the author of *Between Fear and Hope*, a book on post-war Poland.

**MARSHALL SKLARE**—Is a student and writer in the field of Sociology.

**CHARLES G. SPIEGLER**—Is a teacher of English in a New York City High School and the City College of New York. His articles have appeared in several educational publications including the *New York Times* magazine.

**N. P. STEINBERG**—Is a widely-known local artist who has exhibited in Chicago, Philadelphia and New York.

**JUDAH M. TURKAT**—Has published verse in *Voices*, *Midland*, *Westward*, and *THE CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM*.

**HARVEY WISH**—Is professor of American Intellectual History at Adalbert College, Western Reserve University.

# American Foreign Policy and Palestine

By JACOB FREID

IT IS ONLY within the context of America's foreign policy down through the years that the crucial but confused position of United States diplomacy on Palestine takes on significance and meaning. The Palestinian phase of American diplomacy is but the latest projection of a previous pattern. It is a sad result of the impossible attempt to mix a recipe for power politics out of Machiavelli, Washington's Farewell Address, and the Ten Commandments. That is why it is important to project the confusing pieces of the U. S. Palestinian policy puzzle onto the broad canvas of American historic diplomacy which gives insight and meaning to this nation's current in-again, out-again, revolving door quirks and turns on partition.

America has returned to the status-quo-ante Lend Lease in World War II despite its hurried recognition of Israel. For recognition has not been implemented with the aid which would secure the struggling state against all attacks. And although recognition has been followed by war, truce and war again, the resumption of aggression upon newly born Israel did not result in the lifting of an arms embargo that directly contradicted such recognition. The fact that those interested in seeking the solution to this riddle must keep in mind is that American reversals on the issue of partition are but the contemporary instances of a foreign policy which is on the one hand more nebulous and less consistent than that of the other great powers; and on the other is frustrated by its vain attempts to square protestations of morality and the championship of democracy with acts of power politics.

Our present "neutrality" in the war in Palestine is a choice not to make what in effect is a choice parallel to our tacit acquiescence in the Japanese conquest of Manchuria in 1931. The present embargo echoes the Arms Embargo of 1935 in Ethiopia and 1937 in Spain, which made no distinction between aggressor and defender, and proved to be an aid to aggression that, before Pearl Harbor, made the world safe for Fascism and brought democracy throughout the earth to the brink of the abyss. Finally the gyrations of American policy on Palestine resemble our whirling dervish approach to Argentina, ending in its absolution and the restoration of the State Department's 'welcome' mat for the leading Latin-American exponent of Fascism.

## II

In contrast to the monolithic, tight-knit, Kremlin-determined party line policy set by the fourteen man oligarchy of the Politburo, we in the United States are operating in a Democratic context in which public policy is the resultant of the pushing and pulling of a great variety of special interest groups both in and out of the government.

Due to the action of the Founding Fathers, America's constitutional separation of powers between Capitol Hill and the White House with its checks and balances, circumscribe and almost paralyze one another. The result may mean no policy or a policy made up of differences almost impossible to define.

This nebulousness of American policy is due to the fact that:

1. Two-thirds of the Senate must approve our foreign policy.

2. The emergence of the United States into the status of a world power only goes back some 47 years, after three-fourths of a century of little interest in foreign affairs.

3. Even in the State Department there is a lack of consistency and harmony in determining policy. The Department, even to its employees, resembles more or less well-organized chaos. Criticism of the Department is confounded by the fact there is no thoroughly centralized operation, but rather some seven or eight different groups, no one of which completely knows what the others are doing, so that there is no thoroughly unified foreign policy of a well-integrated mechanism of cogs geared to each other's movements. It takes a vigilant, sincerely concerned chief executive to see to it that his promises are not sabotaged (by State Department sheep in Loy Henderson clothing).

The frequent consequence is that U. S. diplomacy resembles the man who either jumped on his horse and rode off in all directions at the same time, or else emulated the police in "Pirates of Penzance" who shouted "We go! We go! We go!" until the hero they were supposed to help answered: "Yes, but you don't go." Unfortunately in the case of foreign policy we are not dealing with comic opera.

In the beginning of its 172 year existence this infant republic was confronted by an environment of many other powers more powerful, and potentially menacing to its freedom and well-being. This hard fact of international life posed a serious problem of adjustment, survival, and adaptation to the United States.

How did the pattern of adjustment develop in the early period of American nationhood and growth? What were the three basic solutions of this problem which emerged in the 18th and 19th centuries?

### III

The three traditional principles of

American foreign policy were: Isolationism; the Monroe Doctrine; the Open Door.

Isolationism goes back to Washington's Farewell Address, written by Alexander Hamilton. As the United States looked across the Atlantic to Europe, and faced the problems posed by Europe and the European powers its solution was to have as little political connection with these powers as possible.

In his Farewell Address on September 17, 1796, Washington stated that "it is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world." Four and a half years later, Thomas Jefferson, in his First Inaugural on March 4, 1801, uttered his famous injunction to seek "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations," and "entangling alliances with none." Jefferson wished to avoid taking sides in animosities, coalitions, etc., of European powers by setting out on an independent course.

The Monroe Doctrine of 1823 was the second principle used in problem solving by American foreign policy. It stated that henceforth the American continents were not to be regarded as subject to any European colonization, intervention, or interposition. It was a negative doctrine of non-colonization and non-intervention.

In 1898 and 1899 the Open Door Policy in China was declared. Under its terms all powers would agree to preserve and respect the territorial integrity and administrative government of China, and would pursue a policy of equal interest to all foreign policy. This formulated a desirable relationship between business and politics. In terms of American attitudes at the time business was a good thing and Politics was a bad thing.

These three doctrines or principles represented more or less adequate 18th and 19th century solutions to problems facing America. But world changes ceased to give them the adjustment or adaptive values which they originally had, and the refusal to adapt them brought America



and the world close to bankruptcy and destruction in the 20th century. These old solutions to new problems no longer worked during two world wars.

Although World War I emphasized the lesson that if you have interests abroad, and the accepted solutions no longer work, you can exert greater power or combine with other powers to exert power, all attempts at combination failed. A peculiar inconsistent adjunct of these three doctrines was that every attempt to make the U. S. a member of the League of Nations was defeated. Senator LaFollette said on the occasion of the defeat of American entrance into the World Court: "Our thanks to Almighty God that America retains its sovereignty and that the principles of Washington and Jefferson to keep us true to no entangling alliances still control."

#### IV

Such ideas lay behind the neutrality legislation of the 1930's—that the United States could keep out of "other people's wars," and protect her interests by refusing to use military forces to defend U. S. interests abroad—apart from the Marines in Nicaragua and such.

On August 31, 1935 the Arms Embargo Act was passed to forbid export of arms or munitions to warring states. It was not appreciated that this repudiated the Kellogg-Briand pact for abolishing war because it made no distinction between law breakers and law keepers, between defenders and aggressors; between keepers and breakers of the pact. Prior to this, the outbreak of the first World War marked the end of traditional diplomacy and the grave threat of a German victory to America. At that time we had recourse to war and won a victory which was then tossed away.

The so-called Neutrality Act of 1935 was approved by a republic blind or mad, which forbade armament exports on the assumption that the U. S. could be kept out of other people's wars by impartiality

to all belligerents. The act prevented aid to Ethiopia. Fascist Italy did not need American arms, but Ethiopia needed them desperately. The effect of the embargo proclamation in the Ethiopian war was to aid the aggressor (just as it currently does in Palestine). However since other products could be sold, Mussolini purchased American oil to fuel the planes and tanks that conquered Ethiopia. This was the result of our effort to insulate ourselves from involvement in foreign wars.

In January 1937 this legislation was extended at the behest of the President and the State Department in conformance with the wishes of Downing Street, Whitehall, and the Vatican which wanted no help given to the Spanish Republicans against Franco, Mussolini, and Hitler. The Republic was thereby deprived of its right to buy arms or borrow money from America although this directly contradicted the commercial relations which the United States had with the Republic as the legally recognized government in Spain. Franco's Spain was amply supplied with arms, tanks, planes, men, and money by the Nazis and Italians who were using Spain as a training ground and experimental laboratory in preparation for *Der Tag*. Similarly, England today insists that America maintain an embargo on Israel while it surreptitiously aids the aggressors with arms, tanks, planes, men and money. In this manner by in effect being "neutral against the Republic" the U. S. helped to assure the Fascist Conquest, just as it in effect aids the Arabs today.

In July 1939 Hitler reasoned—as the archives of the Wilhelmstrasse now show—that if an attack on Poland, Britain, and France were made the victims would be forbidden American aid. However, in a speech to a special session of Congress, President Roosevelt emphasized the threat of the Arms and Loan Embargo to the U. S. He urged a new "cash and carry" basis which was finally approved, permitting belligerents to buy arms and goods from this country.

This still wasn't enough. The folly of the Neutrality Act was that it was One World, and the safety of America depended on its using its decisive economic and military power so as to discourage the fascist aggressors and to prevent the conquest of Europe and Asia by fascism. It was a repudiation of all sensible balance of power considerations in aiding the forces of peace and democracy against aggression and Nazism. The fatuous formula of cash and carry was finally abandoned in the appalling aftermath of the 1940 conquest of Poland, Norway, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, and France. The legislation remained but Mr. Roosevelt maneuvered around it. Today President Truman can supply arms to Israel without resorting to maneuver or subterfuge as in the so-called executive agreement by which President Roosevelt supplied 50 destroyers to England in the dark days after Dunkirk.

Mr. Roosevelt realized it would have been disastrous to adhere to the formal bare bones of neutrality in view of the disaster threatening democracy. He formally recognized the American defense of states against fascist aggressors. He knew that the question was what pattern of power was safe and what was dangerous for the United States. He was not deterred by the naive economic determinism such as today in the shape of Arab-American fuel companies, pours holy oil on Palestine's troubled water. The Fascists countered America's all out aid to the Allies in 1941 with Pearl Harbor and War. The rest as the journalists say, is history.

What then is U. S. foreign policy in view of victory achieved by so much blood, treasure, and ruin? For the final question of human destiny for our time is the question of how the overwhelming power of the U. S. is and will be used. Palestine in this regard is an important sample case.

Two short years ago American policy was to support the UN and the Big Three.

Today its policy is one of challenging the Soviet Union while preparing for war. American policy in 1948 in the debates on Palestine in the councils of the United Nations exhibited in new form the ambiguities and ambivalences of a confused and divided diplomacy which in an old form had led the U. S. and the world to the brink of tragedy and disaster seven short years before. This policy may bring the world and the U. S. to tragedy again. But this time it would be irrevocable.

## V

What is American policy? How did it get that way and why? This is a frustrating question because it is difficult to arrive at a satisfactory answer. Letters to the press trying to figure it out suggest a kind of dual personality with respect to the American position in the world.

First it resembles the Roman state which stood as a symbol of world order. This is the America of the Marshall Plan, and the Friendship Train, an America of social uplifters and physical benefactors to the nations of the world, a nation of the pure in heart and the charitable in purse. This calls attention to the fact that American foreign policy is designed to do the world good: full of the spirit of light, truth, beauty, virtue, and righteousness—the charity and beneficence of our attitude to the world.

However there isn't so much of a difference between doing people good, and doing people Good.

And on the other side of the picture, the swiss *Journal de Genève* believes that the US has three different foreign policies:

1. The foreign policy of the Senate
2. Of the Army and Navy
3. Of the secretary of state.

Sabotage of the President's statements by Sec. Forrestal and Loy Henderson on Palestine, show it is an exaggeration to speak of a foreign policy of Harry S. Truman. American policy today is con-

cerned with the armed might of the Soviet Union; with supporting Chiang Kai-Shek against the Chinese agrarian communists, despite criticism of the Koumintang; with rapprochement with Argentina—with supporting anti-Russian groups in Greece and Turkey, all as evidence of *realpolitik*, both in and out of the UN.

The State Department is more subtle. George Washington is still influential. In two years American policy in relation to Argentina changed three times as a result of contradictions and confusions.

American foreign policy is made up of the Four Freedoms and the principles of Herbert Spencer advocating a return to the happy days of the mid-19th century. I am all in favor of this return to the 19th century. I am extremely doubtful as to how one does it.

But primarily, as the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan prove, American policy is designed today to rescue as large an area as possible from the dominance and power of the USSR. In Europe, in China and in Japan we want to make certain that these areas remain safe bulwarks against Soviet influence and power.

A certain common denominator and formula of American foreign policy is its upholding and championship of democratic capitalism as a way of life, in which the elite of commercial, industrial, and financial entrepreneurs get most of what's to be got. It frowns upon Europe's increasing socialization, it fears its increasing communization. This promotion and protection of democratic capitalism results in great hostility to the Soviet Union which is the menace to democratic capitalism and its world wide extension, and also to the Soviet Union as the one potential enemy to the US by virtue of its power.

This is the basic reason for most of the difficulties between Washington and Moscow; vituperation in the American and Russian press, USSR intransigence in the UN, and Vishinsky diatribes and new

Comintern agreements compound those difficulties.

Unfortunately, it is this unresolved question woven into the fabric of the foregoing outline of American diplomacy that gives significance to the confused position of U. S. policy on Palestine. As noted, America returned to the status-quo-ante Lend Lease while at the same time it hurriedly recognized the newborn state of Israel. The success of James Terry Duce as a lobbyist for American oil companies, and the influence of Sec. Forrestal, formerly of Dillon-Reed in Wall Street, in frustrating the declared policy of the White House has an aroma of "Saudi Arabia No. 5 about it." It is not too strange when placed against the statement by Calvin Coolidge that "the business of America is business."

"Dollar diplomacy" has a long history in the United States. The Isolationist Tradition says America should do business with Europe but not mess with, or play any active role in European internal politics. The Monroe Doctrine said European nations may do business to their heart's content in North and South America but they must not play politics. The Open Door said everybody should do business with everybody in Eastern Asia but nobody should play politics with anybody. Today's Palestine policy is influenced by the ability of Anglo-American oil monopoly to play politics with everybody at the expense of anybody. If this were not so the State Department would not be able to sidetrack the advice of the President and create so wide a gap between American promise and performance. Nor would Mr. Truman appear as contradictory as his insubordinate subordinates are willing to present him.

Former Under-Secretary of State Sumner Welles, who speaks from first-hand experience in formulating American foreign policy, also accuses the Truman administration of gross incompetence on Palestine; of yielding to selfish and mistaken interests; and of reducing the

power and prestige of the UN into hopeless impotence by errors and ineptness "largely determined by the armed services, the oil interests, and fear that Russia might get a foothold in the Middle East."

The sad fact is that by such post-war diplomacy the moral leadership which was America's on V-J Day has since been whittled away on the artichoke principle, a leaf at a time, until the moral differences (despite our protestations of morality, truth, goodness, justice, and virtue as defender of the democratic faith), between the international actions of the U. S. and the USSR has dwindled to the invisible hairline between Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

Despite casuistic legalisms stated by Warren Austin, the American stand on partition after November 29 did as much as Russian recalcitrance to render the United Nations impotent. Our involved semantic attempts to hide the fact merely revealed that hypocrisy is still the tribute vice pays to virtue.

As Richard Watts Jr. wrote in his review of Mr. Welles' book, *We Need Not Fail* in the *New Republic* on June 14, 1948; "Appeasement, particularly when it concerns the possibility of negotiating peacefully with the Soviet Union, is currently a term of deep contempt; yet the British and American truckling to Arab threats represents appeasement in its most humiliating form."

It has been argued that morality had to give way to the demands of power politics in the case of America's shoring up the rotted structure of the corrupt and reactionary regime in China described in the *Stillwell Papers*, and in Greece depicted in the dispatches of Homer Bigart and the late George Polk. But when the newly proclaimed independent state of Israel afforded us the opportunity to support a bonafide infant democracy, born in the image of our own republic, and subject to the same labor pains against the same antagonist in its struggle to survive, we

snubbed the chance to give our words of recognition the deeds necessary to fill their oral emptiness.

It is this angry objection to the crippling of the UN by State Department duplicity; to the "spineless conciliation of the Arabs; to our failure to give proper assistance to Israel" which prompts such indignant arraignments as Mr. Welles' of the incompetent and undemocratic Truman administration policy on Palestine.

The partition vote of November 29, 1947 was a "shout" heard round the world which for several reasons prompted new hope for peace in people's hearts. It was the first evidence of real rapprochement and mutual agreement in the UN on an important action between America and the Soviet Union; it showed that the UN might serve as an important instrument of world opinion put into effect; it pointed to a possible conciliation between the two colossi who bestride the world in the UN councils. All of these combined to hint at the peace which an anxious globe, precariously existing in the shadow of atomic and bacterial death, longed for.

These hopes for a just solution of a menacing problem, for an affirmation of collective security that would restore strength and prestige to the UN—were dashed by the Austin turnabout. The hopes for rapprochement, for peace, for the UN, for a Jewish State, were all shocked by the knowledge that hysterical fear of the USSR, dubious strategic plans for a third world war, and the ugly shadow of Washington-backed oil interests had permitted feudal aggression to win out over peace and democracy. The Lake Success atmosphere as this writer observed it was that of anesthetists trying to keep a patient alive for whom all hope was gone. The pall that descended during Austin's lecture on navigation in the midst of the Palestine storm, came from the delegates' gloomy realization that they were automata going through meaningless motions in a UN reduced to the dimensions of a second League. This



explains the reaction to the speech by Carl Berendsen of New Zealand, for in him the UN heard its conscience and hope for effectiveness as a world organization expressed as over against cynical power politics. Thus Palestine was seen as the same barometer of the UN which the rape of Manchuria had been of the League—the test of whether international relations could be determined peacefully, legally, and by collective consent or else had to be removed from the parliament of man to the fratricidal decision of the battlefield.

As Arthur Koestler wired from Tel Aviv on June 27, 1948, it is the urgent task of Anglo-American policy to hammer out a new policy. "The Western democracies can no longer afford to watch with a disapproving shaking of heads while Mr. Bevin blindly runs amok." Our silent partnership with Whitehall has already cost the world a war in Palestine, hostility in Anglo-American relations, and a drift toward Russia in the Middle East. Only a radical change will avert disaster not only for Palestine but in effecting the global balance of the forces for peace.

Is there hope in American traditional diplomacy shining through the glass darkly of our Palestine blunder? Emphatically yes! A century ago, Daniel Webster, as Secretary of State under President Millard Fillmore, replied to the Austrian government's protest of our adulation of the democratic hero Kossuth, by proudly stating that this nation would always

champion democracy against feudalism, for as events "have their origin in those ideas of responsible and popular government on which the American constitutions themselves are founded, they could not but command the warm sympathies of the people of this country." The truth of this for our time is seen in a letter from Christchurch, New Zealand in the New York *Herald-Tribune* of July 11, 1948, headlined "A Plea from New Zealand that the U. S. Leadership must be developed on Moral Grounds." The writer, J. Drucker, says: "What a great name America could make for herself; what an example to those of us who search in vain for truth and justice—if she had the moral courage to champion a very small state (Israel) struggling for its existence—if we could only say to ourselves here is a great nation which loves truth and justice, which will champion the weak and oppressed for the sake of humanity!"

Instead of our thrusting the better cause into Russia's arms we might re-examine our history and realize that America has stood highest in the hearts of men everywhere when she has remained true to her democratic conscience and moral ideals as the champion of democracy and freedom. "Americans are proud of the brilliant 'Operation Vittles' we are performing in the air over Berlin to get food to the Germans," wrote Max Lerner. If only we would insist upon putting the same brilliant energy into an "Operation Honor" in Palestine!

---

*If the Jews have attained a unique status as a perennial scapegoat, it is due, not to the criminal charges against them that were fabricated in the past as they are today, but rather to the singular role which they have played in the march of European history. Specifically, they resisted Christianity; they struggled against the encroachments of alien cultures; they persisted in their loyalty to their religion. They have constituted in the past, at times unconsciously and unwillingly, a living minority protest against power religion and power politics. For this they were humiliated, suffering martyrdom willingly, often heroically.*

LEO W. SCHWARZ, in *Where Hope Lies*



# Jewish Youth Renascent

By CHARLES G. SPIEGLER

**D**URING the 1936-37 Arab revolt in Palestine, the British Tommy used to amuse himself with a little song that went like this:

Arab, Arab don't shoot me  
Shoot that man behind the tree  
He is a Treacherous Jew  
I am an Englishman true  
So Arab, Arab don't shoot me  
Shoot that man behind the tree

Today that song is outmoded, not only because the British Tommy has left Palestine, but also because the Jew has come out from behind the tree fighting, ready to battle for his survival.

Jewish youth is in the front lines of the struggle for survival, not only physically on the red brisk Israelean soil which so many have died defending, but in spirit, too, on thousands of far-flung battlefields all over the world. As Rabbi Herman Pollack, Director of Brooklyn College's Hillel has put it, young Jews today "want more than memorial services for the Jewish dead. They are literally bursting to redress grievances."

I know this is true—I see it, for example, in the change that has come over the Agudath Israel group in my own high school, which for years was content to sit in prayer, study the Gomorrah, and await the arrival of the Messiah for the better Jewish future. Today they, like thousands of Jewish kids all over the country, are unwilling to sit timidly by and become part of a passive page in history. Today, Jewish youth is pioneering on an offensive in which it is becoming a mover and a shaker in the hectic events already unfolding on the world's

too tragic stage. Through poems, essays, short stories; in meetings, with collections, by activity, they are gushing forth these days in a veritable Niagara that is bursting the dam of indifference with which other generations surrounded themselves.

Where once there were handfuls of Jewish adolescents who would go from door to door with Jewish national fund boxes, begging, "Please help the J.N.F.," and returning often with a pittance for their pains, to-day there are thousands, even as young as 8 and 9 who stand on street corners, march through trains, enter swank business offices, where they deliver deeply sincere one minute talks on why every Jew *must* help! One youngster I know made \$200 this way in a month.

Where once an occasional English theme came across my desk which shyly questioned in its title, "Must I Fear to be a Jew?", today there are dozens with such stirring themes as "The Hero" (Dedicated to a Haganah Fighter), "Land of Hope and Glory," "It's Great To Be A Jew," "The Last Generation of Slaves, the First Generation of Free Men." Where once an anti-Semitic reference in a literary work would pass unnoticed or ignored, today, a 15-year-old like Irma Lieberman, seeing a reference in "Kingsblood Royal" to an international banker looking like a Jew, is up in arms, and wants me to correct a letter of protest she would send the publisher.

In short, Jewish youth is bursting at the seams! I see it in Perry Cohen, just out of a year's service in the army, who has been working hard to get his already belated high school diploma. He rushes

over to me in the hall one day waving papers like mad.

"Hurrah," he bellows, "I got 'em, . . . I got 'em. . . I'm in the Barney Ross brigade. . ."

"How about that diploma you've been sweating for?" is my naive question.

"It can wait . . . this can't. I'm gonna parachute right into Abdullah's lap and stab him to death."

I see it in the five Betar youngsters picketing the swank Trans-Lux Theatre on fashionable Madison Avenue, because it is showing a British film, J. Arthur Rank's "I Know Where I'm Going. . ."

"We Know Where We're Going," reads one of the signs.

I feel this new Jewish verve and gusto in young Joseph Teitelbaum (15), who for one entire week when my school was raising funds for a Red Mogen Dovid ambulance, asked to be excused from my last period class because, "I want to catch that grocery man in my neighborhood before he takes his afternoon nap. I need that donation to fill my quota." (The school collected \$3600 in *one week*). I see it in the pride with which 14-year-old Alice Gutwillig shows me the pin prick on her left arm. She had managed to gain admission to the Red Mogen Dovid blood bank office, despite her tender years. "How did I get away with it?" she explains. "Easy! I borrowed my sister Anna's high heel shoes to look the legal age, and . . . fertig!", she smiles as she swallows a hemaglobin pill her mother had bargained her into taking, for the privilege Alice had been allowed.

And, mirabile dictu, when even Nancy Stander, who is neither religious nor a member of any Jewish or Hebrew group, sits at my desk as I'm going over a little play she has written . . . and doodles out a half-dozen Jewish stars on my blotter, then I know that deep in the subconscious of the average Jewish child today, there lives a simple meaningful symbol.

That symbol is Israel!

On a questionnaire which I submitted

to 200 average American Jewish high school students between the ages of 15-16, I asked these questions:

"Do you eventually want to visit Israel? Why?"

Unanimously the answers were "Yes."

The reasons?

"I want to see what my homeland is like."

"I'd like to see how Jews live without a ghetto complex."

"It is our country."

"I'd like to see where the Hebrew religion was founded."

"I feel deeply in love with it."

This love for a Homeland is not something which has sprung full grown from the head of Zeus. The heart of Jewish youngsters still bleeds for the 6,000,000 Jews annihilated in Hitler's monstrously thorough plot to destroy a whole people. The Jewish kids I know won't ever let themselves forget those tragic letters from Europe, letters more terrible than even their young wild fantasies could allow them to imagine. What is more, large sections of Jewish youth today are clear, very clear, about the political skulduggery in our time which has been enough to disillusion even the most illusioned. How this has affected Jewish adolescents is best described in a composition Claire Koger wrote for me last term under the title "Come of Age." It goes—

"Five years ago I lived in a sheltered world and was barely affected by the tumultuous events about me—Politics hardly took up the major part of my thirteenth year. I belonged to the Girl Scouts. I lived in a narrow world of social dancing, Marshak's malted milks and the movies."

Then—"Suddenly I began hearing about the atrocities that the Nazis were performing. . . . Suddenly things began to happen in my world. Our people began to get shoved in concentration camps, killed by the thousands, stuffed into D.P. Camps. . . . Then we heard stories of brave people who risked their lives in

small boats. I began to read—every book I could lay my hands on, about Palestine. . . . By chance one day I came across "The Rape Of Palestine. . . ." The so called terrorists in Palestine suddenly became a group of proud, noble men to me, not terrorists."

Soon—"I began to follow all the news about Palestine the way I used to track down autographs of Hollywood glamor boys. As I read these articles I became angrier daily; angrier at myself, angrier at the people around me—and angrier at my country and government which allowed these crimes against a peace-loving country to be continued—The more I exhausted myself in trying to find a reasonable answer to this puzzling question, the greater became the tangle in my mind—"

Finally—"I get only one relief now—I reach for the nearest pencil and paper now and I write about my people and their struggle. In this way I relieve myself of these burdensome feelings. In this way, I pour out my wrath at my people's enemies and at the same time express my feelings equally to those friendly towards the wandering Jew—"

How significant is the development in Claire Koger is clearly revealed in a comparison.

In 1943, her Junior High School Year-book parodied this kind of doggerel from her pen and others:

Spring has sprung  
The grass has riz  
You know where the bird is  
The bird is on the wing.  
But that's absurd  
I always thought  
The wing was on the bird.

In 1948, her high school magazine published this:

Faith  
His face is ashen and wrinkled  
his beard is snowy white.  
His eyes are tired but they twinkle  
for the Torah gives him light.

On his bent back is a bundle  
In his veined hands a cane  
His old feet waver and stumble  
But his soul survives the pain.

He is driven from land to land  
Is repelled by many nations  
The star of David in his brand  
and God his only salvation.

But this old haggard man  
still climbs his weary road.  
'Tis now only a span  
and then he will release his load.

God promised him a land so dear  
Indeed Gods' vows are few.  
The tired old man has no fear  
He has faith. He is a Jew.

To conclude from the evidence thus far adduced that all of Jewish youth has undergone a resurgence tantamount to a thorough metamorphosis in its thinking, feeling, and acting life would be a mistake. There aren't many like the group on one East Side block I know which has stopped "Cops and Robbers" and substituted for it, "Haganah against Arabs." There aren't many like the juke box brigade in one neighborhood I visit, which has insisted that the local Ice Cream emporium include Al Jolson's "Israel" and "Hatikvah" amongst their perennial "June-Spoon" favorites. Jewish kids, like all others, are as sport loving, as 'hep' at jump 'n jive as ever. The autograph hunters amongst them, too, will still defy rain, snow, sleet, and hail to wait reverently outside stage doors and hotel rooms to do homage to "The Voice," "The Body," "The Spirit," or "The Look." A prom is still a prom, a crush is still a crush, a moon is still a moon! Natch!

Yet, something new has been added. You sense it in a 'teen age group like the Powder Puff Club at the 92nd St. YM-YWHA in N.Y.C., whose membership had always represented the normal interest adolescent girls have for boys, picnics, and the latest hairdoes.

"Recently, however," as Rabbi Arthur

Chiel of the "Y" puts it, "I noticed that the youngsters in "Powder Puffs," like those in "Club Temptation" and "Sub Debs" were packing my Friday night services (once lonely events) and not only listening avidly to the sermon, but offering to work as hostesses later, when we served cake and tea. Often they would linger on for an hour or so to listen in on an informal discussion concerning some Jewish problem. . . . Even on a beautiful Spring Sunday afternoon, which always was a good day to be with the boy-friend and the camera, now I began to see them occasionally in our Music and Recording room, where we play Jewish records or transcriptions of programs like "The Eternal Light." This year they began to register for my courses in Jewish History and Jewish Customs. Where I used to get a handful, now I have 60-70 trying to get in. At the last model Seder we conducted, I literally didn't have enough seats or Hagadahs for the children who turned up from these very "Powder Puffs," "Temptations" and "Sub Debs" who only until recently thought that a "sidder" was someone who got paid for minding babies."

How can we account for this "new look?" I think the answer lies in the psychological need Jewish youth feels today for identification with what Rabbi Essrig of Hillel calls—"this vast residue of cultural experience—of generations of Jews that have peopled the earth." It is a need that sprang from the insecurity and frustration which Jewish-American youth felt as it watched the destruction of 6,000,000 of its sisters and brothers overseas. The result is that, today, there is a feeling of solidarity with their Jewish brethren all over the world, a profound respect for what has been called . . . "the glorious story of a people that refused to be snuffed out in the fingers of a heartless destiny." All of this has led to a cultural, intellectual, religious renaissance evident in the ranks of Jewish Youth all over the country.

In New York City, for example, seven years ago there were only 11 Jewish schools which had a Jewish music program; today there are 75. Though the study of foreign languages has declined sharply in the past two years, though there has been a drop in high school population, there has been approximately a 20% increase in the study of Hebrew. (Twenty-two Junior and Senior High Schools teach it.) Under the Bureau of Jewish Education, students have been organized on school campuses into Hebrew Culture Clubs whose function is to acquaint students with the cultural treasures of the Jewish past and present (almost 3,000 belong to these clubs.)

Courses in Hebrew and Yiddish are being offered for the first time at CCNY. At Hunter College, Hebrew courses, instead of being optional are now on the "required" list. At NYU, students may, for the first time, now major in Hebrew Culture and Education towards a Bachelor's, Master's, or Doctor's Degree.

A report based on 92 American communities reveals further interesting developments showing the trend towards an intensification of Jewish school programs.

Hebrew weekday nurseries and kindergartens were offered last year in Waterbury, Connecticut; Malden, Massachusetts; Miami, Florida; Portchester and Schenectady, N. Y.; Pittsburgh, Pa; Providence, Rhode Island; Cincinnati, Ohio; Chicago, Illinois, and N.Y.C.

A survey of enrollment in Jewish schools made recently, showed that there were 116,541 children attending week day schools (Talmud, Torahs, Congregational, Yiddish, and All-day schools) and 117,817 attending Sunday Schools. Interestingly enough, almost all the 43 all-day schools, outside of N.Y.C., were established within the last five or six years. The first Yiddish all-day school in the United States was established in Brooklyn last year by the Jewish National Workers' Alliance, and an all-day Hebrew school was opened for the first time last fall in the Bronx.



Even the summer camp has embraced the need felt by many Jewish children for continuing their new-found Hebrew and Yiddish interests. Many like Massad, Yavneh, Sharon, Galil, Lown, where Hebrew is made the natural means of expression, have mushroomed all over the country and have grown as significantly as has Massad from 30 campers in 1939 to 260 in 1947.

In art, the story is the same. "Knock at almost any Jewish heart these days," as one educator put it, "and there will pour forth from it a veritable river rich in a Jewish idiom that has lain latent in it for years."

To be convinced come with me to the Jewish Museum on 90th St. and 5th Avenue. Ride up the elevator to the 4th floor and visit the Youth section of the exhibit. Study the artistry of the hundreds of youngsters from the 125 schools on display (a year ago there were only 25.) Their titles range from "The Creation" to "Solomon's Temple" to "The Warsaw Ghetto" to "Israel—New Garden of Eden." Thrill at the charming American-Jewish calendars, at the colorful Jewish cross-word puzzles, at the murals depicting the sad and joyful stories of Israel's long history; at the puppet show figures built around the story of Purim, at the poignant pictures of D.P.'s and refugees done by Shirley Cohen, (15), who until recently had been content to do landscapes in Central Park. Then listen to Mrs. Temima Gezara, Art Director of the Jewish Education Committee as she tells story after story of what's been happening in the schools; of the Hashomir Hatzair group, for instance, which has literally stormed the Committee's resources for a chance to learn the fundamentals of art so "we can be more creative when we get to Palestine." While working with clay, Mrs. Gezara relates, "There came spontaneously from their hands and hearts, not ordinary American communities, but Kibutzim, not ordinary men but Jewish pioneers, not automobiles

with which they've been familiar all their lives, but tractors with which they want one day to become familiar." Then, your mission completed, walk out and ask the doorman how many youngsters his little counting machine recorded *that one day*. The total is 1179!

This eagerness to identify themselves with Jewish life came home to me vividly one evening when I visited a young Zionist meeting to which a librarian had brought a display of Jewish books (translated into English.) As a result of the discussion and the display, she was besieged with youngsters who seemed desperately hungry for such material, and deluged with requests like "Can you recommend a good one for Mother's Day?" or "Give me one I should get for my cousin's birthday . . . it comes around Purim time. . . ."

It may be argued that what I have thus far reported merely illustrates isolated instances from one man's experience. Perhaps so, but if further proof is needed, let's look at the statement, from Zelda Funk, President of Junior Hadassah (composed of 20,000 girls between 18-25) in which she explains that in Junior Hadassah, among other things:

"We want to make every Jewish girl aware of Jewish moral and cultural values . . . what these values are and how they have influenced the pattern of western civilization; we want our members to study current Jewish problems and their relation to world trends and events. . . ."

Or, read these words in the Preambles of the National Jewish Youth Planning Commission (under the sponsorship of the National Jewish Welfare Board):

"Realizing the need for a program of Jewish survival, we seek to strive through every means at our disposal for cultural continuity . . . also, we see the need for cooperating with youth in other cultural, religious and national groups in this country in order to build a better community for all. . . ."



Or analyze the program of the National Federation of Temple Youth which, starting in 1939 with a few hundred dedicated boys and girls under the slogan "To help Jewish Youth walk in the ways of God, Torah and Israel," now boasts 6,000 in a national federation of 140 groups and includes in its preamble:

- "1) The Synagogue is the institution best suited to serve as a medium for our needs"
- "2) Judaism, *our sacred heritage*, not only is vital in our lives as individuals, but also has, in the ideals of its Torah and prophets, a profound message for a troubled world"

Visit their one and two week camp conclaves on "Judaism Can Be Exciting"

or "Israel Lives Again" or "Building the American-Jewish Future."

Jewish youth is determined to build that future. I'm convinced of it when I read the movie script that one of my own students, Miriam Abidin, wrote in connection with a 16 mm. picture we were planning on Jewish life in our community. Her introduction began—:

This is Delancey Street and Essex. It lies deep in the heart of the East Side. This is the very spot which Hitler and his nefarious map-workers had marked out with an 'X.'

This was where the long range rocket bombs were to fall first in 1943, in the campaign to wipe out American Jews. He failed. All others like him will fail. We have taken up the torch of Jewry, so brutally and violently snatched from our brothers overseas. We will never again let it go. Never!



*At The Scale*

ISAC FRIEDLANDER

# Nightmares of an Old Prisoner

By BEN HALPERN

**B**RUNO BETTELHEIM is known to a public more or less general through his article on "Behavior in Extreme Situations," which originally appeared in a scientific journal, was then reprinted in part by the occasional magazine *Politics*, and was also reprinted in an anti-Nazi pamphlet by the Rev. Leon M. Birkhead. The article, analyzing the psychological reactions and the process of adjustment of prisoners in German concentration camps, was based upon the author's own researches, pursued in conversations with fellow-inmates of German concentration camps, where he was interned in 1938-39 after the fall of Vienna.

Since then Dr. Bettelheim has been living quietly and usefully in Chicago as the principal of the Orthogenic School of the University of Chicago and assistant professor of education at the University. The Orthogenic School maintains a clinic which apparently deals, among other questions of educational psychology, with that of child therapy: the healing of mental disorders which unfavorable experiences or predispositions have begun to implant in problem children. The cases which have come to Dr. Bettelheim's notice include children who went through extermination camp experiences. Accordingly, when Dr. Bettelheim undertakes to discuss questions relating to DP's or to the psychology of the Jew faced with anti-Semitic hostility, he talks (from a certain "extreme" angle) with the voice of experience and of authority—professionally speaking.

It is a pity that—personally speaking—he also talks with the voice of ignorance and fear. What he has to say is fantastic-

ally unreal and illogical; it is also heartless and brazenly perverse. It is, of course, a curiosity of current Jewish and political literature that compositions of such nightmarish qualities should flow from the pen of a psychiatric therapist, a practitioner of the art of healing through realism and reason. But this alone would not make Dr. Bettelheim's two recent productions on Jewish questions\* worthy of special notice.

What is interesting and instructive in Dr. Bettelheim's view is the latent assumption that the Jewish situation is analogous (however far removed and no matter how greatly mitigated) to that of a prisoner, and the Gentile world is for the Jew an attenuated species of *concentration camp*. There is a startling incongruity between this assumption, almost explicitly made, and the conclusions Dr. Bettelheim wishes to reach—that Jews must overcome their suspicion of the Gentiles, put aside their defenses, and open themselves up to comradeship with anti-Semites and potential anti-Semites. "Anti-Semites," says Dr. Bettelheim, "are, for the most part average people—like Jews. And that is most encouraging." The usual thing, in the case of social analysts who lay great stress on this conclusion, and who consider it encouraging, is to think of the antipathetic elements in Jewish-Gentile relations as being artificial, secondary, superimposed upon the real relationship of original equality and mutual interests. But Bettelheim, in coming to this same conclusion, draws all

\* "The Victim's Image of the Anti-Semite," *Commentary*, February 1948.

"Exodus, 1947," *Politics*, Winter 1948.

his illustrations from the concentration camp and from the experiences of concentration camp survivors. It is to Jews conceived in the image of the concentration camp inmate that he gives the therapeutic advice that they ought to *try* to regard Gentiles (anti-Semites) as human beings instead of tormentors.

Some such feeling, that Jews are in a prison of which Gentiles are the warders, is, of course, common to all Jews, whatever their other attitudes. But those who have Dr. Bettelheim's attitudes on various aspects of the Jewish problem rarely use the Exiled situation of the Jew as a basic assumption in either their diagnosis or therapeutics, on a conscious level. They suppress their consciousness of Exile, or they consciously set it aside as merely a *pathological symptom* instead of a basic condition of life. In drawing up a diagnosis of the Jewish psychic condition upon the analogy of the concentration camp, and in proposing a therapy which presumes that Jewish reality is fundamentally analogous to the reality of a prison, Dr. Bettelheim is thinking in an imagery taken from the experience of another extreme wing of the Jews. It is the traditionalist Jew for whom the conception of Exile dominates the structural design of life among the Gentiles. Because he talks in terms which, even in their Bettelheim transformation, are familiar to those reared in Jewish tradition, the doctor, without intent or knowledge, casts an oblique but penetrating radiance into some corners of the problem which his direct statements overlay with so false a light.

\* \* \*

One of the charms of psychiatric literature, at least for the layman, is the practice of presenting evidential matter in the form of anecdote. Bruno Bettelheim, in his article on "The Victim's Image of the Anti-Semite," uses a striking anecdote to establish his central contentions: namely, that in the social context of anti-Semitism,

the victim, no less than the aggressor, develops a stereotyped image of the other party; and that if the vicious circle is to be broken, the victim (the Jew) should overcome his stereotyped image of the oppressor, and approach him through his *individual traits*, thus discovering in him a common human basis upon which living together would become possible. The anecdote is told in the name of N. a psychologist, and a friend of Bettelheim's.

After the assassination of the Nazi diplomat von Rath by Herszel Grynszpan, orders were given at a certain concentration camp not to treat Jewish inmates at the clinic except when they had been injured while working for the S.S.

In the fall and winter of that year many prisoners suffered from frostbite. The Jews were worse off than the others because they were not allowed to work indoors. In many cases, chilblains led to gangrene, and amputations became necessary. So, despite the order, many Jewish prisoners tried to get their frostbite treated. They had to explain their cases to an SS private who had the power to admit or exclude them from the clinic. Even before the new rule barred them, very few Jews had succeeded in gaining admittance. All Jews were prejudged as malingerers, and suspected malingerers were sent away with a whipping.

N., too, suffered from severe frostbite, and prisoners with medical experience warned him that if his hands were not treated soon, they would have to be amputated. Convinced beforehand of the near-hopelessness of the attempt, he went one day to join the line in front of the clinic.

As the prisoners discussed among themselves the chances of receiving treatment, N. was struck by the fact that most of them had worked out in detail a plan of action which, they hoped, would get them into the clinic. Some intended to stress their service in the First World War, their wounds and decorations; others planned to impress the guard with the seriousness of their cases; still others, to invent some lie—for instance, that a Gestapo officer had ordered them to report for treatment. They tried to convince themselves that the SS man would not be clever enough to see through their stories.

When N. was asked about his plan, he truthfully replied that he had none, and that he saw little use in fabricating one. He would watch the behavior of the particular guard—especially the way he handled the other prisoners—and act

upon such clues as offered themselves. A preconceived plan seemed impractical, since it took no account of the individual guard's personality and prejudices. His fellow prisoners responded in an entirely unfavorable way, even to the point of violent and insulting aggressiveness. They accused him of having some subtle plan of his own that he did not want to reveal, or else of eavesdropping on their conversation so as to steal the most plausible excuse for himself.

Most of the twenty-odd prisoners who preceded N. were turned away, though many had extreme cases of frostbite. The more they pleaded with the SS guard, the more vicious he became. Complaints of suffering amused him and stories of military service aroused his anger. From the way the guard talked and acted, it became obvious to N. that his mind was saturated with the typical Nazi stereotypes about Jews, and that attempts to sway him only put his back up. N. also observed that though he was cruel, he was not unusually sadistic for an SS man—he did no more than kick the prisoners he sent away. Moreover, he seemed somewhat more intelligent than the average of his kind.

When N.'s turn came, he told the guard that he had come not to ask for treatment, but simply to inform the clinic that he could not work with his hands in their present shape. He concluded by asking if it were possible to have his hands freed of the dead flesh hanging from them; since prisoners were not allowed to possess scissors or knives, he could not do this himself. He spoke in as matter-of-fact a tone as he was able.

The SS man answered that if that was all there was to it, he would tear the flesh away himself. He began to pull at the festering flesh, while N. successfully suppressed cries of pain. After a short time, finding it impossible to pull the flesh loose, the SS man gave up the job and ordered N. into the clinic.

My purpose in relating this incident, (continues Dr. Bettelheim,) is not to press home any trite moral about the Spartan virtues. Rather, it is to point out the fact that N. was successful because he broke through the cast of the traditional stereotypes, both of the oppressor and the oppressed. The SS man had been taught that all Jews were cowards and cheats who took advantage of Gentiles by deceit. He therefore expected them to try to wheedle their way into the clinic by devious means. Thus the obviously prepared stories of the prisoners confirmed his expectations. He probably realized that he was less intelligent than many of the prisoners, and the cleverness of their stories only enraged him the more. This cleverness was a threat to his ego, and he had

to demonstrate that their intellectual superiority was futile. N.'s behavior in this situation did not put the SS man on the defensive through a show of superior intelligence. By making the unexpected claim that he wished to be helped to work, he forced the SS man to abandon thinking in stereotypes and to evaluate the situation in a new light. Since N.'s behavior, moreover, showed that he possessed the same 'heroic' virtues professed by the SS, in rejecting N. the guard would have rejected his own scale of values.

\* \* \*

It is striking that in Bettelheim's version, the moral of the anecdote takes this particular turn. I say "in Bettelheim's version," because curiously enough I have come across the same story in two other versions, in each case as related by survivors who went through a similar experience. The search for the human being in the SS man was not confined to academic and coldly practical minds like the psychologist N. or Bruno Bettelheim. It was a quest quite common in the saga of a new culture hero of our time, the concentration camp victim, and its incidents have been coalescing into a broader epic myth. But the two versions I heard are authentic enough. Both come from the mouths of Orthodox Jews.

L., a famous leader of the ultra-Orthodox Agudas Israel organization, was the rabbi of a town in Poland under Nazi occupation. One day he received a summons from the local SS Commander. As he went to obey the summons, stricken with grim forboding as on all such occasions, he chanced to think of an old Khasidic legend: A wonder-rabbi traveling in a forest, heard the howls of wolves encircling him. He thought: Why do I fear? Are not the wolves God's creatures like myself? I shall meet the wolf and see in his eyes my brother. When the wolf confronted him, he looked deep into his eyes and saw there his brother. The wolf looked back into his eyes, and also recognized the rabbi, and let him pass in peace. Now, thought the downcast L., should not I, too, try to see in this German my



brother, and try to talk to him as to one of God's creatures? He decided to do so.

Upon being admitted to the SS Commander, L. stood before him and received his orders as on previous occasions. Then he said, "May I ask you a question? . . . Please, do not be alarmed," he continued, seeing the SS man stiffen and bristle in suspicion and surprise, "I mean no harm, it is only a simple question." Encouraged by silence, he asked, "What do you mean to do with us in the end?" The Commander paled and began to pace back and forth in some agitation. "Sit down," he gestured toward a chair; certainly the first and only time a Jew had been invited to sit in that office.

"You evidently think," he began after a while, "that we run things according to some democratic procedure, so that I could judge from discussion what plans are under consideration. It is not that way at all. We are a dictatorship. I get my orders, and I carry them out. I know what I am told to do today—and I do it. Tomorrow? I know nothing."

The other version of the story relates the experience of a simple, pious Jew, undistinguished from millions of others, who nevertheless was the hero of a saga of unexampled gallantry: \* he had worked and suffered in seven successive concentration camps, never, during all that time, having omitted a single day of prayer, wearing his phylacteries according to the Jewish rite. He earned the death penalty for every such act of daily prayer. But knowing that he was to die in the end anyway, he thought he might as well die for praying as for some more meaningless act.

He tells of the time he was caught in his daily crime. A curfew had been imposed on the camp confining all inmates to barracks. He had left his phylacteries in a different barrack, in the care of another Jew who also observed the rite of daily prayer. He managed to get into

the other barrack undetected. He prayed hastily and removed and hid his phylacteries. But as he was trying to cross the road once more to his own barrack, he was caught by his Block Leader, an old Polish common criminal, appointed to a post within the camp by the Nazis.

As Dr. Bettelheim's studies of "behavior in extreme situations" helped to make us understand, this old prisoner, in addition to his own streak of cruelty, had adopted the SS "scale of values" and generally applied it with a vengeance. His unfortunate captive, certain of death, did not try to dissemble but admitted the criminal purpose for which he had broken the camp curfew: he had gone to get his phylacteries which were hidden elsewhere in the camp.

What happened then with that criminal, is hard for me to understand to this very day. He burst out in a roar of laughter, and shouted: 'Don't try to fool me, dirty Yid!' Then suddenly he ordered me to roll back my sleeve and show him the marks of the phylactery straps. I was so surprised that I simply showed him my left arm, where the marks of the straps which I had tied on in such frantic haste were still quite plainly to be seen. 'It's true, little Yid,' he howled in wild laughter. I was frightened out of my wits, certain my last moment had come because of this manifest crime. But he suddenly went over to the alarm bell and summoned all the prisoners to an urgent assembly. When all the prisoners were assembled, trembling in fear of some new catastrophe which seemed to be in the air, the *goyish* gangster stood before them and delivered an oration 'All of you assembled here are all dirty mangy dogs. I didn't believe there was one piece of scum among the lot of you ready to die for his faith. Now I've found one, this one here, standing before you, I admit I am surprised. I won't do anything to him, and from now on he can pray in public, and anyone who dares to disturb him will answer with his life. Understand, you dirty dogs?' That's how that unclean felon spoke, and I simply couldn't believe my ears; perhaps it was the prophet Elijah who came to rescue me, and took on the appearance of our cruel oppressor. It was a real miracle, and all those assembled saw in it a miracle from Heaven.

I do not believe anyone can read the three versions of the same story quoted above without sensing at once how gro-

\* His story is told by M. Prager in the Hebrew weekly, *Hadoar*, April 23, 1948.



tesquely false, how discordant to its setting and to the ethics of the situation is the first version, how accurate and realistic is the second, and how ethically true is the third. Taken as advice to concentration camp inmates, the Bettelheim version is shocking in its blatant stupidity. Granted that N. was successful that one time in taking the SS private by surprise with a new approach, can Bettelheim seriously mean to suggest that Jews could have survived in the extermination camps by these tactics? The record of planned murder over a four-year period (1941-5) which implacably destroyed all manner of Jews—including those Jews who tried to adopt the SS "scale of values" to the extent of doing minor chores in their murder campaign—makes such a suggestion ludicrous. The second version is far truer in its reflection of reality, as well as aesthetically truer: when a Jew really meets the human being in an SS man, he can prevail to the extent of an invitation to be seated—but not of altering his ultimate fate, of revoking his ordained doom.

Ethically, too, the Bettelheim version is odiously false, where the other versions ring true—with particular clarity in the third version. The victory of N. in Bettelheim's version is a false victory, for it was won by accepting—or by a successful pretense at accepting—the characteristic "scale of values" of the SS. In the other two versions, the oppressor, for a moment, is surprised into *stepping out of character*, dropping his SS "scale of values," in order to offer courtesy to a Jew, or to spare his life.

Bettelheim's psychological interpretation of his anecdote shows the most extraordinary professional myopia. When the psychologist N. offers his hands to be torn by the "not unusually sadistic" SS man who "seemed somewhat more intelligent than the average of his kind," Bettelheim interprets this as a rational maneuver, whereby his *alter ego* N. forced the SS to meet him as man to

man upon a commonly acceptable "scale of values." The veriest tyro in modern psychology should be capable of a more discerning analysis than this. Bettelheim himself, in his article on "Behavior in Extreme Situations" gave us a more valid account of this type of transaction. In the first "interrogation" of prisoners at concentration camps, Bettelheim observed a routine which all the accounts of his informants as well as his own experience confirmed. The first torturers were fierce and unrestrained, but as the victim's inner resistance was more and more broken, the new SS interrogators who came to continue the torture became more perfunctory in their efforts. The main thing was not so much the pleasure of torture as the need to establish the inferiority of the prisoner to his SS captors. In the N. anecdote, the other prisoners were still struggling to *save themselves*; N, by offering his hands to be torn, symbolically accepted the masochistic attitude which was the ultimate goal of the SS manual of sadism. He did, indeed, meet the SS man on his own "scale of values," but not on any *human* scale in the sense "human" ordinarily has.

In this respect the third version of the story shows the most penetrating insight. The Polish Block-leader, the common criminal who spared the Jew's life, is shown in a double light: he spared a life only to make a mockery of the other prisoners—in this he was acting in character, according to the "scale of values" of SS sadism; but, in recognition of heroism, he spared a life—and in this, where he became truly "human," he was not acting in character, but, through a miracle, acted as the prophet Elijah.

\* \* \*

In charity to Bettelheim we can only assume that he did not mean his anecdote to be read as a diagnosis and a proposed solution for the problems of Jews in an actual concentration camp situation. It should perhaps be read as a parable told

in order to teach principles of behavior for less extreme Jewish situations. And after the errors resulting from the failure of a preceding generation to recognize the Exile character of the Jewish situation, a parable drawn from the concentration camp might not be without value—if it were true to the innermost ethical meaning of the concentration camp situation. But is Bettelheim psychologically open to such an understanding of the situation?

In his first study, on "Behavior in Extreme Situations," Bruno Bettelheim delineated certain psychological processes among various types of prisoners. There were the New Prisoners, who tried by every device to retain the individuality they had possessed outside the camp. Their family and friends outside remained the center of their attention; but the unknown changes which took place outside, during their imprisonment, undermined the security of their former place in society. They began to resent their family and friends as changes wrought estrangement, and the measure of their bitterness marked the growth of their inability to understand the outside. As for the inner reality of the camp, their attachment to the outside disabled them from adjusting to this, too. Among them, a special group—the Middle Class Prisoner—was particularly deficient in understanding reality. Feeling that they were different from the common criminals, the Jews, and the political prisoners who formed the rest of the camp inmates, feeling that they should never have been arrested, that it was all a mistake, they were incapable of solidarity with the rest of the prisoners: they did not understand the situation even to this saving extent. Finally there were the Old Prisoners. These had completely lost touch with outside reality—they had little interest in it at all and cherished the most fantastic notions about their future, if ever freed. On the other hand, they were fully adapted to the new concentration camp reality. To a large extent, they had adopted as *their own*

the "scale of values" of the SS; for example, they were known to demand continued adherence to rules laid down in a momentary caprice, and promptly forgotten, by the SS. They enforced the SS "scale of values" against New Prisoners with considerable cruelty. It is only in later accounts than Bettelheim's—in Rousset, or Kogon—that we learned how far this acceptance of the SS "scale of values" and this cruelty towards New Prisoners—Jews, gypsies, non-politicals—went.

Obviously, none of the above types could be psychologically capable of a true account of the meaning of a concentration camp parable for life outside. The mental and moral distortions, the blind hostilities of each type toward the outside world and toward their fellow inmates of one kind or another—all these surrogate expressions for the true and "reality-oriented" but impotent hostility toward the SS—block them from insight. Only one attitude in concentration camp situations, or in situations of the same kind, could keep a true perspective and maintain a human set of values: the attitude of group solidarity within the whole prisoner mass. The annals of anti-Nazi resistance provide many examples of this attitude. Yet it is not among the psychological mechanisms described by Bettelheim. Did he fail to run across it, or was he incapable of understanding its significance?

\* \* \*

Be that as it may, the attitudes displayed in Bettelheim's two recent essays on the Jewish problem bear a strong resemblance to the mental and moral aberrations mentioned by Bettelheim in his account of the stages of an adjustment to the SS "scale of values." If one conceives Jewish life as faintly similar to that of a concentration camp, Bettelheim's attitudes are those of an Old Prisoner, with traces of an original status as a Middle Class Prisoner. They are marked

by an immoderate hostility towards his fellow-Jews, and a most extraordinary compulsion to ruin the Jew's moral position, to put him in the wrong through whatever ludicrous pretense, to make him the victimizer instead of the victim.

This tendency is manifest, to a careful eye, in the essay on "The Victim's Image of the Anti-Semite." In the anecdote we quoted, the pitiful attempts of Jews "to stress their service in the First World War, their wounds and decorations" (did not Jews have real services, wounds, and decorations?), or "to impress the guard with the seriousness of their cases" (were they not serious?) or even "to invent some lie"—this futile clinging by New Prisoners to the illusion, in which they probably no longer believed themselves, that the values of the outside world still existed—are scornfully and even indignantly repudiated. N.'s own plan reveals an attitude reminiscent of the Middle Class Prisoner, a type described in Bettelheim's first study as setting himself apart from the prisoner mass. When the others taxed him with having "some subtle plan of his own . . . or else of eavesdropping on their conversation so as to steal the most plausible excuse," they were right as to the ethical core of the matter. He *was* being false to prisoner solidarity, he *was* setting himself apart as a special case, he *was* using his fellow-prisoners as guinea-pigs whose trials and errors he observed in order to find a way out for himself.

But a far clearer case for Bettelheim's classification, in the social psychology of Jewish Exile, as an original Middle Class Prisoner hardening into a typical Old Prisoner, may be construed in his later article, the shocking outburst of nonsense and malice printed in *Politics* under the title "Exodus, 1947." Here we are dealing with a non-concentration camp situation, and with a historical fact, not a parable. Yet Bettelheim's reaction reveals the same mixture of blindness and aggression towards his own kind which typified the

deteriorating moral insight of some prisoners in the concentration camps.

We shall not stop to discuss all the errors of fact and reasoning, or all the irrelevancies in his piece: "It was clear that Palestine could not admit all Jews left in Europe"; the old chestnut about giving America back to the Indians; the extraordinary logical maneuver of arguing that while Jewish DP's naturally want to go to Palestine, American Jews in their place would want to go to America, therefore they are morally wrong in helping Jews try to go to Palestine, instead of America; the heartless irrelevancy of suggesting as a substitute for an effort to land these particular Jews in a safe harbor—pressure on Congress to pass the Stratton Bill; etc, etc.

What is more interesting is the psychological pattern of this article. From beginning to end, it is a venomous outpouring of hatred toward American Jews. The writer does not dare to attack the European Jews who risked the horrors of the *Exodus* journey: they, after all, had been in the extermination camps. Jews have no right to Palestine. The country is too small to hold them. If they make it large enough, they will rob the Arabs of their native culture—which they have no right to do. The *Exodus* journey was a breach of immigration regulations in Palestine. It is irrational to stir up Moslem feeling against the Jews. In spite of all these arguments, the DP's, Bettelheim concedes, cannot be expected to act rationally, morally, justly, or legally; their suffering and their present emotional state excuse everything.

But, the American Jews! They were never in concentration camps. At the time when Bettelheim was being beaten by Nazi guards, they were living comfortably in New York and Chicago. For that Bettelheim can never forgive them—for that, and for being Jews, fellow-prisoners. "American Jews who acquiesce to the hardships which American immigration laws imply for many who desire to

make their homes here, have little *moral* right to complain about British immigration restrictions in Palestine." Why didn't they charter boats to bring the *Exodus* Jews to America, instead of breaking British law? "If immigration laws must be transgressed, it is *morally* more justified and *more courageous* for Americans to break the laws of their own country than those of the British. *Then we ourselves would have faced the music. . . .*" At this point, the wish to see American Jews in a real, effective, physical prison (if possible, no doubt, a Dachau) instead of an insubstantial but annoyingly and incomprehensibly existing Ghetto, becomes all too clear. Bettelheim backtracks. "It was hardly the purpose of this discussion to advocate the chartering of American boats so that 'uncertified' Jews might be brought to our shores in violation of the immigration law." But American Jews could surely have worked and waited till the Stratton Bill was passed before feeling entitled to ask the British and Arabs to admit more Jews to "their" country—where instead of integrating into "an existing (non-Jewish) community of power and culture" (an Old Prisoner's wish dream), Jews form an all-too-tangible community of their own.

Having driven too far—to the point where the hidden wish became apparent in consciousness—the fantasy of American Jewry in Dachau, Bettelheim recurs to another theme. In this he transforms the American Jew into the anti-Semite, with Britain cast in the role of the Jew. American Jewry is guilty of "scapegoating," with poor Britain as the goat.

For a time—until the British made it clear that they were getting out—it was fashionable among many circles of American Jewry—and not only among Jews—to discharge a great deal of hostile feeling against the viciousness of the

British who kept Jews from entering Palestine and put them behind barbed wire in Cyprus. I cannot help feeling that this anger against the British was a projection of the anger of American Jews against themselves for not doing their duty towards the Jews in Europe. . . . But objection must be raised against their making a scapegoat of the British and blaming them with evils which American Jews were equally unable or unwilling to remedy.

The psychological background for this statement is the fact that during 1938-39 Bruno Bettelheim was in Nazi concentration camps while American Jewry was at liberty. It was characteristic of the prisoners he studied at that time to develop hostility toward their family and friends who were at liberty. But even more basic in Bettelheim's resentment is the obvious fact that, in the typical reaction of a Middle Class Prisoner, he regards not the Jewish *situation* but Jewry itself as, for him, an Exile, a prison, an attenuated concentration camp. *Hinc illae lachrimae.*

\* \* \*

The reader will have noted signs of ill-feeling and resentment on the part of this writer toward Bruno Bettelheim; perhaps more than the quotations cited would themselves justify. The psychological background of this feeling, too, should be explained.

I know personally American boys who helped to organize such voyages as that of the *Exodus* 1947, and who manned the "rotten excursion boats" on many a trip. One in particular, Ari Lashner, was shot in the back by an Arab sniper and died last year at the Galileean settlement of Kfar Blum. I have been unable to write an appreciation equal to his bright, glowing memory. Let me at least answer his blind detractor.



# ISRAEL:

*Selwyn S. Schwartz*

. . . And as you walk in Promise into Elected  
Space, look up and bless its inhabitant  
Rocks, David's gleaming crowns on each hill;  
Moses identity of private sleep apparent  
Under God's tree, the odor of fruit.

Come child, this is the day.

Inhale, O, all love of prophet's horizon.  
The night like a blue horn stirs Ancient  
Sleep, and the singing tear a glowing  
Octave in mid-air, while morning sealed  
To your unsuspected eyes reweds once more  
Shofar's exultant sound:

Come child, this is the day.

O Partisan of Centuries vision bent  
Of biblical attitudes into Ours.  
On such a day even the sun of emblazoned  
Diction roars like a witness in your ear  
Through the eternal palms of Zion:

Come child, this is the day.



# After Restrictive Covenants...

By STANLEY MOSK

**T**O ASSUME that the decision of the Supreme Court on race restrictive covenants will forever banish housing segregation in America is to indulge in the luxury of wishful thinking. Neither the history of race relations in this country, nor the present social and political climate justify that luxury.

Even though we undertake a pragmatic analysis, however, we must not overlook the remarkable milestone reached by the momentous decision of the court, written by Chief Justice Vinson. That it may have been long overdue, that it does not grapple with numerous social problems of segregation, that in obscure phraseology it may render some small encouragement to diehards, does not in any respect detract from the essential forthrightness of the high court opinion.

That the participating justices were unanimous is of particular significance, when one appreciates that Chief Justice Vinson and Justice Black have their roots south of the Mason-Dixon line, and that Justice Burton is a conservative by political background. The traditional liberalism of Justices Jackson and Rutledge was missing, since they and Justice Reed had seen fit to disqualify themselves for unannounced reasons.

The reaction of the press, strangely enough, was substantially favorable. Widespread criticism of the court's decision might have been anticipated in view of the failure of metropolitan newspapers previously to express opposition to the spread of the restrictive covenant technique; in view of the economic power of vested real estate interests that deem covenants an essential investment protec-

tion; and in view of the press being generally loth to consider either housing or racial problems sympathetically. Whether the fourth estate has suddenly awakened to an appreciation of the vice of racial segregation, or whether it was merely awed by the unanimity of the highest court in the land, is subject to speculation.

True to form, however, the halls of Congress echoed with the southern accents of hate. Rep. John E. Rankin called upon the House to upset the supreme court decision, crying that "white Christian Americans seem to have no rights left which the present Supreme Court feels bound to respect. The ruling destroyed the value of property owned by thousands of loyal Americans." And his Mississippi colleague, Rep. John Bell Williams, forecast ominously that the decision "did more to bring about a revival of the Ku Klux Klan than anything that's been done in forty years."

At the other extreme, the communist press damned with faint praise. The *Daily People's World* of San Francisco called it "a cautious, quibbling document" and found it "hardly a ringing charter of human freedom or an unequivocal attack on racial discrimination." It did concede, however, that "this does represent progress."

The New York *Herald-Tribune* found the decision "the only right one . . . making possible what any other ruling would have denied—a freely evolving solution of any given community's race problem." The San Francisco *Chronicle* editorialized that "it is a good and proper thing that the high court has reaffirmed an overriding doctrine—that there is a law of

the land which cannot be used against itself . . . despite resistance, this is to predict that the decision will play its part in the gradual erosion of prejudice." New York's *PM* hailed it as "adrenalin for the bloodstream of the tired and discouraged liberal . . . a magnificent affirmation of the true strength of democracy, of the glory of this country's equalitarian tradition." However, the *Los Angeles Times* crudely missed the principle entirely, and saw in the decision only that the supreme court "has exposed our neglect of a certain kind of planning or zoning in expanding cities. . . . those who feel deeply that racial groups are mutually exclusive, and should be, must now seriously consider the fact that the frictions of mixture will end only when provision is made for ample group colonizing space. . . . To pretend that there are no race problems and to deny that the several racial groups are not naturally exclusive are not only stupid attitudes; they are criminally negligent."

Representatives of minority groups were unanimous in their approval of the court decision. Thurgood Marshall, counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, indicated "it is obvious that no greater blow to date has been made against the pattern of segregation within the United States." Dr. Stephen S. Wise, on behalf of the American Jewish Congress, believed the decision "knocks out the most important prop of the ghetto system which has increasingly disgraced and disfigured most of our American communities and which un-American forces in our midst are seeking to maintain." Judge Joseph M. Proskauer, president of the American Jewish Committee, called it a "milestone in the democratic effort to eliminate discrimination in the enjoyment of basic civil and political rights by all groups, regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin."

The fact that the court test was won under the leadership of the National

Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and that of the six lawyers who presented the arguments to the court four were Negroes, is important, wrote the *Los Angeles Sentinel*, a leading Negro journal, "by way of giving us courage and fostering self-reliance and hope."

But of equal significance is the fact that more than twenty national organizations filed briefs as friends of the court. The Rosenwald Foundation, AFL, CIO, American Indian Citizens League, Japanese American Citizens League, American Jewish Congress, American Jewish Committee, Unitarian Church, American Civil Liberties Union, American Veterans Committee, National Lawyers Guild, and many others. As the newspaper *PM* put it, "Here was a case of minority groups joining forces until they came to represent a majority of the people. There is a lesson in that, for all liberals fighting all causes."

And joined with that majority of the people was its government. The Justice Department courageously submitted a brief *amicus curiae*, and not content to rest with that, appeared for oral argument through Solicitor General Philip Perlman. The gratuitous entrance of the federal government into litigation in which it was not a party deserves the highest commendation, and is some indication of sincere devotion to the president's civil rights program. After the decision was rendered, the Justice Department took further pains to advise the public that in its opinion the ban against racial covenants included prohibition against covenants based on religion. In a footnote, the court made this significant addendum: "Restrictive covenants of the sort involved in these cases have been used to exclude other than Negroes from the ownership or occupancy of real property. We are informed that such agreements have been directed against Indians, Jews, Chinese, Japanese, Mexicans, Hawaiians, Puerto Ricans, and Filipinos, among others."

The basis of the court's decision was the fourteenth amendment, which dates back to the period immediately following the Civil War. In 1866, a congressional joint committee on reconstruction, composed of fifteen representatives, proposed a constitutional amendment forbidding any state to "abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States." The opposition of President Johnson, then extremely unpopular, gave impetus to the drive for ratification by the necessary number of states, although pressure on the defeated confederate states through federal military rule was undoubtedly a contributing factor.

A shrewd railroad lawyer, then a republican congressman, John A. Bingham, added by amendment an apparently innocuous clause reading "nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." He had in mind that a corporation is a "person" within the meaning of the law.

As the reconstructionists, through the excesses of carpetbaggers, lost their control of the confederacy, the individual states through legal devices passed by their legislatures, and demagogues through terror inspired by the hooded Ku Klux Klan, negated the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment, while courts were scrupulously concerning themselves with the rights of corporate litigants under the due process clause.

It is therefore paticularly noteworthy that today's high court, in setting forth the fundamental principles underlying its decision, and again in its summary, made it abundantly clear that the constitutional demand for equality among citizens was the real issue to be considered. In its concluding paragraph, the court said:

The historical context in which the fourteenth amendment became a part of the constitution should not be forgotten. Whatever else the framers sought to achieve, it is clear that the matter of primary concern was the establishment of equality in the enjoyment of basic civil and political rights and the preservation of those

rights from discriminate action on the part of states based on considerations of race or color.

To the man complaining that his rights are denied if he is not given the support of the courts in enforcing private agreements the Supreme Court unfeeling replies:

The constitution confers upon no individual the right to demand action by the state which results in the denial of equal protection of laws to other individuals. And it would appear beyond question that the power of the state to create and enforce property interests must be exercised within the bounds defined by the fourteenth amendment. . . . Equal protection of the laws is not achieved through indiscriminate imposition of inequality.

Nevertheless, in his opinion Chief Justice Vinson did use certain language which gives a small measure of comfort to race covenant advocates. The fourteenth amendment, he wrote, "erects no shield against merely private conduct, however discriminatory or wrongful. We conclude, therefore, that the restrictive agreements, standing alone, cannot be regarded as a violation of any rights guaranteed to petitioners by the fourteenth amendment."

Thus it seems clear that covenants are not void *per se*. They are not wicked, or necessarily violative of public policy or morals, as, for example, contracts to operate gambling or bawdy houses. They are *malum prohibitum*, but not *malum in se*.

Continuing in his opinion, the chief justice said, "So long as the purposes of those agreements are effectuated by voluntary adherence to their terms, it would appear clear that there has been no action by the state and the provisions of the amendment have not been violated."

Such a conclusion of the court may be confusing to the layman, who has difficulty in perceiving any value in a contract that cannot be enforced in a court of law. While it is obvious that an agreement that is judicially unenforceable is of greatly diminished worth, one cannot overlook the moral suasion upon good people of integrity who place intrinsic

values upon their or their assignor's solemn signatures to a written instrument. That one who practices and seeks to compel discrimination at the same time pleads morality of the pledged word may seem paradoxical, but we cannot deny the fact that many pious churchmen and churchgoers are among the most vocal racial segregation advocates.

The realtor, the professional race-baiting agitator, the frightened home owner already are seeking desperately to find alternative devices and subterfuges that might withstand a court test. The May 8 Kiplinger Washington Letter, "circulated privately to businessmen," boldly offered a number of suggestions.

The attitude of the organized realty groups was expressed by comment on the court decision by Robert T. Furman, Jr., vice-president of the National Real Estate Clearing House: "People will and are entitled to choose their associates and will continue to do so."

That substantial realtors intend to serve the interests of those who will continue to demand restrictions has been indicated by a tendency of many firms to raise prices "selectively." Property that has a reasonable market value suddenly develops an outrageously inflated price to a non-Caucasian. Others advise prospective "undesirable" purchasers that their deed will contain an option to repurchase, so that while one outside the favored racial classification may freely buy, a "more appropriate" buyer will immediately appear and have the right to exercise the option to repurchase.

In Los Angeles recently, when a wealthy Negro physician indicated an interest in attending probate court and bidding on a home in exclusive Beverly Hills, the neighbors banded together and announced they would jointly put up the funds to outbid him, and then resell the property, though at a financial loss. The doctor understandably lost his interest in the site. Parenthetically, it might have served a useful purpose had he under-

taken lively bidding in the court auction, thus compelling the neighbors to pay an exorbitantly high price for the house, and tangibly demonstrating the economic waste in discrimination.

Another circumvention proposed by real estate brokers is the formation of a social club in a neighborhood, the memberships therein to include the right to purchase property. Still another is a liquidated penalty provision, by which a covenantor agrees to pay a substantial cash sum to the other signatories to the covenant in the event he sells his property to specified types of persons. Though ultimately unenforceable, such provision, implying protracted litigation, serves as a deterrent to a seller inclined to breach his restrictive agreement.

What shall be the program of the liberal in the days to come, assuming there will be opposition to bona fide acceptance of the court decision by various devices and subterfuges, and that there may be some incidents of violence when individual members of "undesirable races" move into an area theretofore deemed restricted.

In the latter situation, organizations must insist upon full protection of the law for the new arrivals, and prosecution against those who either commit overt acts that breach the peace, or suggest threats and intimidation.

If the situation in a community neighborhood becomes sufficiently alarming, an alert, civic-minded group might undertake a door-to-door campaign of education in basic principles of democracy. Public meetings in such a situation may be fraught with dangerous possibilities, for the constructive approach frequently competes unsuccessfully with the emotion of the rabble-rouser intent on preserving the sanctity of illusory realty values.

Circumventions that purport legally to restrain occupancy of property in areas on a racial basis should be constantly under court attack. Under the doctrine that courts will not permit that to be



done indirectly which it forbids to be done directly, the likelihood that a fool-proof evasion of the clear intent of the supreme court decision can be devised is remote. But civic-minded groups that have relentlessly fought covenants in courts of the land must allow no acquiescence in any evasive devices.

Groups and individuals must demand that all governmental agencies conform to the letter and spirit of the court decision. It has been paradoxical that while the Justice Department maintained that restrictive covenants were illegal and contrary to public policy, the Federal Housing Administration has affirmatively required racial clauses in deeds before guaranteeing property loans. The FHA insists upon restrictions even in areas where the builders opposed them, and compelled reluctant builders to capitulate in order to obtain financial backing. Long before the court decision, I felt this discriminatory use of the public credit would not have withstood judicial scrutiny.

Individual liberals themselves must exercise the courage of their convictions. A well-known theatrical personality in Hollywood recently found the highest bidder for his exclusive home to be a colored family. Though the seller has always been an outspoken public advocate of equality and liberalism, he declined to sell to the family, for fear of "what the neighbors would think" of him.

True perspective requires one to treat

all purchasers of property alike, regardless of race or color. An owner must determine his terms, and then sell to the prospective buyer who meets those terms. While it may be urged that it is unkind deliberately to seek a buyer who would be objectionable to the neighborhood in which the seller may have pleasant associations, certainly it is morally indefensible to yield to those purely artificial and undemocratic objections.

The ultimate result of the end of legal restrictive covenants may not be perceived for some years. Certainly the ruling is not comparable to the cannon shot signal that started the homesteaders' rush in the Cherokee Strip. Nor will the boundaries of Negro ghettos crumble like the walls of Jericho.

But the decision is a seven league boots' stride forward in American race relations. Once all people are able to live together they will work together, their children will go to school together, they will by constant exposure absorb mutual respect and understanding. As the late Will Rogers said so simply, "I never met a man I didn't like." The problem has always been for man to meet man, for all of us to break down the web of artificially constructed barriers that prevent normal human intercourse. The highest court in the land has put the torch to one of the major barriers, by stripping from housing segregation its only measure of sanctity, the cloth of legality.

---

*The American people need no reminder of the service which those of Jewish faith have rendered our nation. It has been a service with honor and distinction. History reveals that your people have played a great and commendable part in the defense of Americanism during the World War and prior wars, and have contributed much in time of peace toward the development and preservation of the glory and romance of your country and our democratic form of government.*

PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, in a letter dated  
August 13, 1938 to Jewish War Veterans in the United States

# Robert Morss Lovett

By CARL GRABO

THE RECENT AUTOBIOGRAPHY of Robert Morss Lovett,\* will be welcomed by thousands of his former students and by innumerable others unknown to him personally to whom his name and his work have become a legend. Jane Addams and Eugene Debs were so esteemed in their day, personifying, each of them, one aspect of the endless conflict in behalf of human decency and freedom. Robert Lovett in our time personifies liberalism, a political attitude and philosophy now too little understood by the younger generation.

The true liberal is without dogmatism, follows no party line, believes in no absolutism, whether fascism, communism, or any other. The true liberal will work for common ends with others of whatever religious, political, or economic faith to the improvement of social conditions. He is an individualist and welcomes individualism in others. He conceives the good society to be one in which every member is free to speak and act in whatever way he chooses consistent with an equal freedom for others. Compromise and adjustment in this pursuit of a common end are inevitable. He concedes their necessity and is ever willing to cooperate. Yet he will never compromise his basic beliefs, which, though few, are enduring. For whatever debases the human soul and enslaves one human being to another he has no tolerance. Pity for both the oppressor and the oppressed he will have, but no tolerance for the belief or philosophy which endeavors to justify

such oppression. For his faith in the potential dignity of human beings the fighting liberal will, if necessary, suffer martyrdom. Robert Lovett has repeatedly displayed his willingness to endure abuse, calumny, and persecution in behalf of his convictions. He has demonstrated his physical and moral courage. Those who share his beliefs but are of a more timorous nature admire him because he is what they would wish to be. There, they feel, but for deficiency in courage go I. A fatal deficiency, indeed, in a world in which physical force still rules and the controversies of men are not settled by moral suasion and sweet reasonableness, or, at least, imperfectly so.

It is notable that many social reformers have been reared in a militant Protestantism. Protestantism at its best asserts the equality of men, each equally important in the eyes of a God known to each in the promptings of his own heart. There are dangers in such a belief. It has produced fanatics, men so sure of the one road to salvation that they have used violence to coerce others to follow it. But softened by humanism and freed from too great a religious dogmatism it has produced men, like Tom Paine and many others, who have professed a "religion of humanity." Robert Lovett, who is of this persuasion, is of a New England Puritan heritage. He is an admirer of Milton, the Milton who in his prose works said great and enduring things of human liberty and freedom of speech and the press.

Readers of Robert Lovett's autobiography will be a little surprised at first

\* *All Our Years*, by Robert Morss Lovett, New York. The Viking Press, 1948. 373 pp. \$3.75.

thought with his attraction to the ministry and his conversion at an early age by a revivalist. It proved not to be lasting in its effects and he suffered the usual torments of thoughtful boys of his generation in constructing a faith in which the will to reason and the findings of a scientific generation were reconcilable with the religious impulse. Robert Lovett became, apparently, though he does not specifically so declare, an agnostic like many eminent Victorians of the generation prior to his own, Huxley, George Eliot, and the rest in whom a deep religious instinct turned for its expression to humanitarian philosophies and social good works when the traditional creeds proved inadequate. He is of their order, product of the same forces. It is popular nowadays to dismiss the Victorians as of small permanent importance, their philosophy as outworn. We are arrogant in our ignorance. The best of the Victorians were fine stoic agnostics, willing to give themselves to the service of humanity, to subordinate selfish ends to the good of all, and this without hope for, or belief in, any other—worldly reward. Disinterestedness, courage, and magnanimity can find no finer examples in history. These were the liberals of a generation of whom Robert Lovett is heir, not wholly without his compeers but these all too few.

The consequences of this heritage and upbringing, this religious sincerity which was dissatisfied with traditional orthodoxy, are evident in Robert Lovett's first career as a teacher and, in the latter half of his life, as a social crusader, a soldier of fortune on all the many battlefronts of progress, lending arm and sword to every worthy cause.

It was in a missionary spirit, I believe, that Robert Lovett renounced a career at Harvard, where his brilliant scholastic record would have led to academic advancement, and accepted a place on the faculty of the new University of Chicago under the presidency of William Rainey Harper. Students of the institution in its

early years perceived, in one or another of their instructors of New England origin, a dedicated spirit resolved to bring culture to the unenlightened. Bring it they did and not without incidental benefits to themselves. Fifty years ago more of the equalitarian pioneer spirit survived in the Mid-West than is perceptible today. Social stratification due to differences in wealth was not so marked as now. The University of Chicago has been one of the civilizing agents in this transformation, retaining, it is to be hoped, in the enlargement of its culture some of that democratic spirit which once informed it.

If it has not the fault lies elsewhere than with Robert Lovett, whose spirit of understanding and helpfulness struggled successfully with a native shyness and diffidence so that his students were permanently influenced by him, as many in later years have recognized and acknowledged.

This influence was not doctrinaire. He preached no isms nor did he abuse his position to inculcate any specific beliefs. But the perceptive student developed under his guidance the critical mind, learned to question all dogmatisms, and to think for himself. This was once the narrower aim of a university education, more so I believe than it is today, much to the loss of the present generation which, one gathers, is taught to conform to one or another academic cult—critical, philosophic, or religious. Someone has remarked that in the best years of the classical department at the University of Chicago, Professors Shorey, Capps, and Hale differed violently one with another, much to the profit of the enquiring student, who from this conflict of authorities learned to discriminate and fashion his own opinions; if, to be sure, he had sufficient capacity to do so. There was no one accepted dogma to be dispensed from on high. Truth was not so single, sure, and indivisible as now seems to be the case. The sceptical mind is surely the best

product of the educative process and the teacher who can develop it in his students the best kind of teacher.

Is it an illusion due simply to advancing years that the teachers of forty and fifty years ago seem in retrospect more individual, more eccentric if you will, than the teachers of today, and the student therefore subjected to more varied influences than now? Heretical teachers were, to be sure, attacked then as always. Those who openly criticized business monopoly and the capitalistic system sometimes lost their jobs under pressure from donors or prospective donors. All was not rosy. Yet where are these martyrs of today? If they exist they are not conspicuous. Congress, in its committees dedicated to the eradication of un-American activities and the detection of subversive thinking, may create for us such a noble company. Perhaps in this day of conformity and prejudice, when the college instructor is tempted to hold his tongue if he is to hold his job, it will be a good thing if Congress in its witch-hunting reveals some supposed enemies of the American-way. The American way professedly once encouraged free thought, free speech, and valiant criticism of our social and economic ills. We need to be dedicated anew to these aims.

The American way, it is true, was always more notable in profession than in deed. Robert Lovett was attacked and his position endangered. It is to the everlasting credit of his university that it defended him in his right to speak as he thought fit and to engage in social activities deemed radical and dangerous by reactionaries. In the second phase of his career, when his public activities were conspicuous, he still retained his academic position. Yet one wonders from a suggestion here and there whether universities nowadays are not more careful than once to employ only those with correct views in matters social and economic and so unlikely to cause embarrassment. Universities are still bound by tradition

to defend academic freedoms but they are loath to be put to the test. A judicious selection of its teachers and the quiet pressures which a university knows so well how to apply by denying promotion and salary increases to those restive under authority usually suffice to insure conformity.

In one respect, whatever may be the rights of this controverted question—the liberalism of the university of today as compared to that of yesterday and its willingness to defend academic freedoms—in one respect the present day university has fallen far from the achievement of an earlier generation. Robert Lovett, Robert Herrick, and William Vaughn Moody created in the University of Chicago a school of writing which produced many able writers. The teaching of English composition was once on a parity with that of literature. Such is no longer the case. The most exacting of educational disciplines, and the best, has fallen into desuetude. There are no successors to Robert Lovett and Robert Herrick. Young literary aspirants nowadays study the literary market and follow the advice of tipsters. There is, as a poor substitute for the rigors of English composition, much fanfare about scholarly disciplines and the merit of the trivium and quadrivium, whose hierophants excel chiefly in obscurity and dogmatism.

Robert Lovett had the good fortune in the early years of his career to live in a better day. The teaching of English composition was highly esteemed and he and his contemporaries added further luster to its repute. His students found in him an inspiration and a guide. They appreciated him and have expressed their esteem. He quotes with pride what one of them, Meyer Levin, has written:

He never preached and he never lectured. Yet somehow I got from him a sense of being backed up, approved, as long as I was engaged in finding social truth. If he can be said to have encouraged any single tendency in literature, I believe that in his intangible and yet powerful way he did encourage this tendency. I would



never show him anything that I didn't feel basically good. He's the kind of teacher who continues to look over a writer's shoulder, all through a man's writing life. It is good that he's there.

No teacher could ask a finer tribute, one which innumerable students of Robert Lovett who have never expressed their gratitude will gladly echo.

It may be that Robert Lovett's greatest influence on his time lies in the incalculable radiations of personality on the lives of students who, in their turn, have been influential in the arts and in social affairs. But it is by his association with innumerable groups and societies devoted to progressive causes that he became known to the country at large, the object of devotion to the oppressed and of malignant persecution to those reactionaries to whom every evidence of liberal thought and generous disinterestedness in the cause of human betterment is the signal for attack.

It was not as a reformer that Robert Lovett began his career of social usefulness. He seems not to have been especially aware in early life of the forces which rule our society, the domination by wealth and unscrupulous power of our political, economic, and cultural institutions. It was the events leading to the First World War, the unsuccessful effort to keep out of it, the struggle for peace without victory, and the illiberal reaction which ensued that involved him increasingly in the many movements for freedom, political and economic, which have characterized the last thirty years and whose end is not yet. Our generation is in the midst of a struggle from which will emerge either a new social order which has resolved our most destructive economic conflicts or which will revert to some form of autocracy, communistic or fascistic—the latter in all probability. There remains also the third possibility that our civilization will destroy itself in the process.

In the many groups which have fought

the illiberal tendencies of the age Robert Lovett has played a conspicuous part. To name the organizations of which he has been a member, national and international, would occupy too great a space in this commentary. Clearly his participation in them was as educative to him as his services were useful to them. The nature of the world conflict became clearer, the conflict of economic class interests, the contest of capital and labor, of the haves and have nots, which underlies political rivalries both domestic and foreign.

During the years of the First World War and the years of political persecutions which followed, the treatment of the conscientious objectors especially aroused his indignation. . . . "I had a new reason to hate war, and on the other, I carried in future years a resentment against the ruthless exercise of power by the strong against the weak, and a disgust at a society which permits it and the government which condones it." Elsewhere he quotes from Disraeli's novel *Sybil*:

Two nations between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy, who are as ignorant of each other's habits and thoughts and feelings as if they were dwellers in different zones or inhabitants of different planets; who are formed by a different breeding, fed by a different food, ordered by different manners and are not governed by the same laws—the Rich and the Poor. (*Italics mine*).

He had not in his earlier years had much belief in the stock phrase the "class war" but his experiences with many organizations engaged in the amelioration of social ills and his long association with Jane Addams at Hull House convinced him of its validity.

Three notable instances within the last sixty years of class warfare in our society highlight the struggle which still continues. The first was the Haymarket Riot and bombing of 1886 in which seven writers for anarchist papers were convicted of a crime perpetrated by some unknown person. "It was a shocking travesty on justice in which Judge Elbert

Gary, sitting on the bench with prominent ladies beside him as guests, boasted of making the law as he went along." The victims of this outrage were convicted and four of them executed not because of any overt crime but because their political beliefs were deemed subversive. The dominant group in our society were afraid and wreaked their hatred, born of fear, on those who abhorred them and their autocratic rule.

Fresher in the social memory of today is the celebrated Sacco-Vanzetti case, similar in kind, in which two innocent men, anarchists by faith, were framed and convicted by government detectives and by the judicial processes of the state of Massachusetts of crimes they did not commit. The evidence has been analyzed by the best legal authorities. Justice Frankfurter's findings are definitive. Judge Thayer, who presided, and whose name is infamous, sentenced the "anarchist bastards," as he called them in private, and all the efforts of outraged humanity in this country and abroad were unable to save them. Neither the judge, the governor, nor the advisory committee which the governor, Alvin Fuller, appointed to reexamine the case, Robert Grant, a retired judge, President Lowell of Harvard, and President Samuel N. Stratton of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, seriously considered the evidence which disproved the defendants' connection with the crime. Like the Haymarket case before it, the judicial murder of Sacco and Vanzetti is a clear instance of the fear and hatred which animates the ruling class when it deems its power and privileges threatened by the underprivileged classes. Governor, Judge, and committee alike yielded to the social pressure of that class, of which they were the servants, and did its bidding.

Robert Lovett was one of the editors of the *New Republic* which fought the case, seeking to arouse public opinion and enlisting many notable figures on behalf of the victims. Social workers,

artists, and writers joined in a protest demonstration on Boston Common. "They were clubbed and jailed by the police, thirty-nine of them." Robert Lovett blames himself for not having succeeded in raising more money, fighting the case more successfully. Clearly there were errors and failures in the defense but it is equally clear that no efforts would have availed. His own summary is just:

The Sacco-Vanzetti case was an emotional experience in my life. It forced me to accept a doctrine which I had always repudiated as partisan tactics—the class war. It is clear that the two Italians—the good shoemaker and the poor fish dealer—were in the end victims of class hatred. The legal questions were lost sight of in the hatred of the ruling class for two men who challenged it. The opinion so often heard that whether they were guilty or not, Sacco and Vanzetti must die, was the judgment of the rich and well-to-do against the poor.

The third and most recent instance of this class brutality and murder is the massacre on Memorial Day of 1937 of striking workers at the Republic Steel plant in South Chicago. The workers and their families engaged in a parade.

As the parade advanced, the police without provocation opened fire. Some ten persons were killed and fifty wounded. The Paramount moving picture taken showed policemen beating the fallen victims on the ground. Their friends were not allowed to give first aid. The wounded were put under arrest. Some died in the police cars in which they were being conveyed to hospitals many miles away. The Senate Committee on Civil Liberties, headed by Senator Robert W. La Follette Jr., conducted an inquiry which revealed stupidity and cruelty which shameless perjury could not cover up, but the police who were summoned, including the Chief Commissioner, remained unmoved in the face of testimony by photograph and word. For months, however, the showing of the Paramount picture in Chicago was forbidden. The coroner's inquest was held in the Criminal Court Building, and took on the function of a regular court of justice, which found the wounded guilty of the riot. Later they were subjected to fine and imprisonment.

At the meeting of protest Robert Lovett and Paul Douglas spoke, but, the author remarks, "No influential citizens came to our support, as I am sure would have

been the case with the generation I had known in earlier days." These are words weighted with a terrible portent. Indeed the three cases of social injustice cited are the gravest indictment of our social order that could be framed. Have we become apathetic over the miscarriage of justice? Have the mass horrors which we have witnessed in the last decade dulled us to lesser cruelties? Or has the whole standard of decency in our civilization declined in the last generation? These three atrocities occurred before the last war and cannot be attributed to Hitler and his example though they are similar in kind to the horrors of Polish concentration camps. They signalize the same callousness, the same ruthless will to power. And they may well prophecy some disaster to the state, some debacle of the old order. The American way of life, if it tolerates such abuses, is doomed sometime, whether late or soon, to perish. Volney in his eloquent work, on the "Ruins of Empire" recounts the perished civilizations of the past. All, he says, were destroyed because they were based on injustice. For the Sacco-Vanzetti miscarriage of justice and for the Memorial Day Massacre in South Chicago our country has done no penance, attempted no expiation. We choose to forget. But we cannot blot them out. They fester in the subconsciousness of a people. The guilt complex of which they are a symbol will manifest itself in other and more terrible activities and can lead, under some American Hitler, to mass coercion, to class domination by overt force, and the government by gangsters—a prelude to anarchy and chaos, as in Germany.

Robert Lovett's own *cause célèbre* was due undoubtedly to his reputation as a liberal and a fighter for social justice. As such he was hated by illiberals. Appointed Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands in the now commonly execrated period of the "New Deal," he was instrumental in effecting social reforms in this neglected dependency of ours and in earn-

ing the undying gratitude and affection of the islanders. This record of social usefulness did not prevent his being brought before a committee of the House of Representatives for examination for his previous association with organizations allegedly subversive—this at the instigation of the investigator for the Dies Committee.

In his numerous social activities and his associations with humanitarians, liberals, and radicals of all shades of political opinion, Robert Lovett had acted on the simple principle of working with anyone in behalf of a good cause. It was the cause alone that mattered. He could see no reason why liberals and communists should not work together, for instance, in behalf of world peace. He felt no taint of communism in so doing. Indeed, as a liberal he could not possibly be a communist, for communists, at least as evidenced in our day, are as intolerant as those of the extreme right and will not suffer the sweet reasonableness of liberalism and its emphasis not on creeds or formulas but on the practical ends of social well-being, social justice, and the democratic practice of live and let live. These profound differences between liberal thought and communistic dogma should have been evident to any committee reasonably intelligent and informed. This committee was apparently neither, or more likely was out to "get" him on whatever pretext.

The hearing as recorded and quoted by the author is a sad commentary upon the depths to which Congressional Committees of inquiry can descend in their violation of all decent procedure and in the baiting of witnesses. Those who have not the patience to seek the full record will find in Robert Lovett's book a sufficient summary. It is the record of Star Chamber procedure and a disgrace to the American tradition of fair play. Suffice it that Congress, on the Committee's recommendation, struck out from an appropriation bill funds for the salaries of Lovett and two others, Watson and Dodd, who

were victims of similar unwarranted indictments and examination. Though the Senate demurred, the bill was passed. As is well known, the Supreme Court later declared the action by Congress unconstitutional, and Lovett and the other two were to that degree vindicated.

The cause of justice and liberalism in this instance fared better than in the celebrated cases previously discussed. Nevertheless it is clear that the action of the committee caused injury to the defendant which no subsequent finding by the Supreme Court could wholly rectify. A citizen summoned to defend a charge of disloyalty suffers, whatever his subsequent vindication may be. His name, in the minds of the casual reader, becomes associated vaguely with something reprehensible. He is put to great cost of time and trouble and perhaps to considerable financial cost, and all this to appear before a tribunal which pursues methods which would never be tolerated in any decent law court. The victim of a "smear" inquiry has no means either of adequate defense or redress.

The activities of these Un-American Committees of Investigation are an ominous sign of the times, like the failure of the citizens of Chicago to support Robert Lovett and Paul Douglas in the protest meeting held to denounce the Memorial Day Massacre. Robert Lovett has been a fighting liberal. Seemingly there are few nowadays in public life who are liberal in the true sense and few in private life who, if liberal, will fight for their beliefs. The growing intolerance evidenced by legislators and their agents set to inquire into the private lives and beliefs of citizens inevitably develops in its victims an

equal intolerance. Governmental intolerance fosters the growth of the very communism it seeks to eradicate, for Communism, too, is an intolerant creed. It may be that governmental bodies know very well that Communism is today no menace to American institutions but that under pretext of attacking communism they can hamstring or suppress freedom of thought and criticism. The enemy of tyranny is free thought and free speech, not any political creed or theory. The first acts of Hitler and Mussolini upon the attainment of power were the silencing of a free press, of freedom of inquiry, and the freedom to criticize the tyrant and his acts. Robert Lovett's memoirs, covering but three-quarters of a century, bear sad evidence of the decline of democratic dogma and democratic practice in his day.

Despite his tragedies and defeats Robert Lovett, on the evidence of his memoirs, has lived a happy life in so far as any highly imaginative man can be happy in a world like ours and in a time like this. He has lived zestfully and fully. The tone of his book is magnanimous and kindly. He has few harsh things to say of anyone. The reader may wish a little more acidity. A touch of malice now and then would impart flavor. Malice, too, is a fine preservative. One would like also, more conclusions, more philosophic comment. We act, says Plotinus, in order to provide food for thought. In his retirement may we not ask Robert Lovett to write a book to supplement this, one which will give his views in a form less crowded with the record of events? He has not said fully what he makes of our society nor risked a prophecy as to its future.



# Rothschild

By MORTIMER LEVITT

**P**RECEDENT WAS SHATTERED during the parliamentary elections of Great Britain in 1847 when a Jew was elected to the House of Parliament. The Jew, Baron Lionel de Rothschild, a grandson of the famed banker and descendant of that branch of the family that initiated banking institutions in England, amassed a considerable vote in the London borough he contested, but when he proceeded to Parliament, could not take his seat because there were words in the oath of office objectionable to him—or to put it bluntly because he was a Jew.

A storm of controversy raged throughout the British Isles—in the streets and courtyards, in the exchanges and business houses, in the churches and even in the high councils of state Englishmen asked one another whether their Jewish compatriots deserved the right to sit in Parliament, and the issue's broader implication, whether Jews should be allowed the privileges and prerogatives of first class citizenship. Thus, for the second time in a hundred years, the problem of a minority with inferior civil status, which had nevertheless achieved positions of social and economic prominence, became a question that was on every man's tongue. (In 1758 mob violence had forced the government to abandon plans to emancipate the Jews).

Some argued that the Jew did not merit citizenship because his religious beliefs prohibited him from being a loyal citizen; others who were above this type of demagogic appeal opposed the emancipation measure because they believed in the principle of national conformity. Sympathetic and even friendly towards the Jew

as an individual, they still could not forgive him for being a nonconformist.

On the other hand, those in favor of religious liberty, pointed to the obvious benefits Jewish industry and enterprise had brought to Britain, and stoutly maintained that "tolerance" was Christ's gospel, and moreover that the imposition of religious interdictions did not make Christianity any the more secure, but in the end hurt Christendom as much as Jewry. These proponents of the Jewish cause were drawn from many diversified strata of society; for example, the common people of London, who elected Baron de Rothschild three times to a Parliament they knew would not receive him; the journalists, who took bold stands, exposing to ridicule the prejudices and misbeliefs that were beclouding the issue; and the statesmen, of high and low degree, who risked public careers to agitate for the end of this last injustice sanctioned by English law.

Much of the anti-Jewish sentiment, prevalent especially amongst the lower classes, was due to the persistence of medieval superstitions as to the religion of the Jews, superstitions that had had wide currency in Europe for centuries and were not yet dispelled. Agitators made capital of the fact that the Jews of England had been ignominiously expelled from the kingdom in 1290. The previous history of the Jews in Great Britain is helpful in understanding the popular feelings of Englishmen at the time Baron de Rothschild was being humiliated because he was a Jew.

Not until 1655, when Manasseh ben Israel, leader of the Dutch-Jewish com-

munity negotiated a treaty with Cromwell, were the Israelites allowed to return to Great Britain. Charles II honored his predecessor's pact with Rabbi ben Israel, and the Jews returned in peace. They settled largely in London and other big cities, happily at a time when England's rapidly expanding foreign trade required throngs of entrepreneurs and small brokers to take risks, make investments, act as intermediaries with foreign businessmen, and otherwise promote this new source of English prosperity. That they did fulfil this task is borne out by the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, which writes: "The Jews' commercial utility, momentum of their enterprise and stalwart patriotism proved irresistible. . . . From the exchange to the city council chamber, thence to the aldermanic court, and eventually to the mayoralty itself. . . . These were necessary stages of an emancipation to which their large interests in the city and high character entitled them."

Thus it was that after four centuries Englishmen again began to make contact with the Jew, this time, moreover, retaining a favorable impression of him. But, no matter how personable, diligent, and meritorious the Jew was, the fact still remained that he did not conform to Christianity at a time when the Church taught, the crown enforced, and the people believed the ideals of national conformity. That in order for a nation to remain truly Christian, no recognition whatever could be given to members of a nonconformist religion, was the belief of that day.

Consequently when, one hundred years after the Jews returned to Britain, Prime Minister Pelham in 1753 proposed to Parliament a measure that had as its aim the emancipation of Jews, the streets of London were filled with rioters threatening to overthrow the regime should the government go ahead with its plans. Pelham reluctantly abandoned the idea and not until 1830 when parliamentarian Robert Grant introduced the Jewish

Emancipation Bill was the issue even revived. But Grant's Bill was shelved and the next and most decisive test came to pass when a Jew himself decided to make an issue of the cause of religious liberty; that is when Baron de Rothschild ran, was elected, and refused to take his seat until the objectionable words were removed.

This flagrant anti-religious act, perpetrated by the highest body in the land angered the staid London *Times*, and there appeared an editorial in its columns on January 15, 1848, chastening those Englishmen who so readily accepted the benefits the Jew had brought to Britain and yet were unwilling to accord him the elementary rights of citizenship. The *Times'* editorial, entitled "Abrogation of the Jewish Disabilities" is here cited in particular and quoted from liberally because it typifies the arguments used by proponents of the Jewish cause and at the same time faithfully records its antagonists' remarks. Although there were basic weaknesses in the *Times'* argument, it still served to expose the arguments of those opposed as based on false assumptions or on rank prejudice:

It will soon be seen what reception will be given in the great council of the nation to the verdict of its greatest city in the last case of religious liberty. The question would not be worthily settled if the decision were otherwise than formal, explicit, given on a clear understanding and by a candid vote.

Our own opinions of this subject are already known, nor are we greatly apprehensive that they will be far from at variance with those of the nation. The theory of religious disabilities in civil affairs has been so long abandoned that little need be said to convince any thoughtful advocate of the opposite system that the removal of Jewish disabilities is both a consistent and necessary development of a long established principle. We say that the disabilities now affecting a Jewish candidate for Parliament are the last of a long series of similar restrictions differing in no essential point from any others which have successively yielded to the suggestions of humanity and dictates of reason.

When the spirit of the age has involuntarily and insensibly become such that not the smallest repulsion is indicated by citizens of the two

creeds—when the followers of the proscribed faith are employed in all the common duties of citizenship and are confessed to be exemplary in the discharge of them—when they take not only equal but extraordinary rank in the social scale, when they are admitted to acquisitions of influence and offices of trust, how can they be consistently visited with a disability based only on assumptions which are practically exploded? A Jew can only be reasonably excluded from Parliament on account of his misbelief or on account of opinions dangerous to the commonwealth. The latter cause will not be alleged since the political demeanour of the Jews is allowed to be beyond exception. If the former cause held good in this case, it holds good in every other. If the Jew should be visited for the sins of his father with any severe incapacity, he should be visited with all sort of those examples of active persecution which humanity forbids. It is impossible that a man who conscientiously votes against the admission of a Jew to Parliament can conscientiously hold any but necessary deals with him in any other transaction.

This is a fairly typical line of reasoning employed throughout by the *Times*. The editorial writer insists that in order to follow the arguments of those opposed to Jewish emancipation to their logical conclusion, it is necessary for Christians to revert to the barbaric practices of the twelfth century. It was inconsistent and hypocritical to deal with the Jew as an equal in one phase of life and as an inferior in another.

"A Christian can only justify a vote of exclusion on this particular," reiterates the editorial, "by a continuous expression of his conviction in all other actions of life—by a return in fact to that general deportment towards Jews which has been abolished by the operation of the surest and most unexceptionable agents. Nature and reason have insensibly decided the point and their judgment may be read in the daily events of life."

Nor did the *Times* have any use for those who urged a diplomatic, "gentlemanly" solution, one that would have circumvented the obstacle to Jewish citizenship by a legal loophole. Unceremoniously it informed them that, after two centuries of treatment as an inferior, and

added to that indignity, the burning memory of an ignominious expulsion, the country owed it to the Jews to welcome them as citizens through the front door, and not sneak them through the side entrance:

We lately published a letter in which it was accounted that the test at present supposed to operate against the admission of the class in question to the nation's councils might have been evaded without any illegality. Much of such reasoning may be true, but to proceed on its suggestions would not be more unbecoming to the country itself then unacceptable to that portion of its citizens who were to benefit by the evasion. The question was not thrust upon the court by clamor and it is not to be decided by shuffling. An honest, straightforward sentence of the House upon the continuance of the religious disabilities of the Jews is the judgment by which Jews will abide. They will not avail themselves of the shabby shelter of a quibble. It is a "grave political question" and it will not be unconstitutionally solved.

However, it is extremely doubtful whether some of the arguments advanced as pro-Jewish in 1848 would tie in with democratic concepts of religious equality as the term is understood today. Many well meaning individuals, the *Times* included, never once used the term "rights" when speaking of the Jew, but rather employed those expressions "sufferance" and "tolerance," negative forms of consent at the very best, which are today regarded as connoting a privilege bestowed by the enlightened majority upon the stubborn minority, a privilege that can be revoked at will.

Thus the *Times* in its admittedly courageous fight to raise the Jew's status and eliminate those legal barriers working against him, always hastened to reassure the people of England that Christianity would not be imperiled by such a move, and that if for one moment it thought that a rival religion by its mere presence alone would undermine the position and prestige of the state religion, then it too, would oppose the abrogation of the Jewish disabilities!

The most plausible argument alleged against the impending decision is that inasmuch as it

will amount to a national negation of Christianity, it must most seriously injure the prospects of national religion; that it destroys our character of a Christian kingdom which we had hitherto retained and removed that last barrier which might have been opposed to national indifference or infidelity. Such arguments are serious indeed. We admit they would decide the question if sound.

The cause of religious liberty was seriously weakened by the wavering of its proponents on this religious part of the issue. Their elaborate and casuistic arguments in favour of a negative consent and their complete omission in their briefs of the democratic principle of equal rights, compromised their own arguments, and somehow did not ring true in the ears of the public.

At first the only satisfaction that could be had from the recalcitrant members of Parliament to the public clamor was the smug reply that Baron de Rothschild might enter the House whenever he took the oath of office that was so distasteful to him. This he neither could, nor would, do. An amazingly loyal electorate, respecting the man all the more for clinging to his beliefs, reelected him to office again in 1852 and still another time in 1856. Evidently they preferred to go unrepresented for ten years rather than to see anyone else as their delegate!

It was more likely this genuine appeal from ordinary citizens, who knew when they were seeing an injustice done, rather than the compromised arguments of the intellectuals, that finally budged the members of Parliament. In 1858 the Jewish Emancipation Bill was passed, and Baron de Rothschild entered the House of Lords as a peer.

Jews, and the cause of religious liberty, owe much to this eminent statesman, rich and powerful in his right, who never had to enter politics or submit to this humiliation and indignity. As was his hope, he lived to see the day when he could enter the House without any sacrifice to his conscience, and when the meanest of his co-religionists could pray as a Jew and live as an Englishman.

There is one particular lesson about the Rothschild "affair" that can be made to apply today. It is that the minority with a burning problem gained nothing while it stood aside and allowed its Christian friends to argue the question. Only as the Jews themselves took the initiative and made out their own case for the public, was the matter taken into consideration and ultimately settled. The Jews of England might still be deprived of citizenship had not one of their number spoken up.

---

*"A conspiracy is afoot against the Judaeo-Christian world outlook, and in consequence against the Judaeo-Christian ethic, the concept of the infinite worth of every human being, the thesis of the brotherly unity of mankind, the doctrine of the objective validity of moral law, the norms of justice and mercy as regulative of individual and social relations. The attack has been long in the making; the forces behind it are many and diverse, deriving from virtually every area of human interest. The defense is equally composite. All sorts and conditions of men have for all sorts of reasons rallied to its banners. Quite fortunately, this is everybody's fight. Anyone—white or black, Gentile or Jew, believer or denier—is welcome to enlist in it."*

MILTON STEINBERG, *A Partisan Guide to the Jewish Problem*



# Zola and the Dreyfus Case

By S. L. SHNEIDERMAN

**T**HIS YEAR marks the fiftieth anniversary of a work which crowned the career of one of the nineteenth century's greatest writers, a man who became a symbol of courage in the struggle for human rights. *J'Accuse* by Emile Zola had a great deal to do with the outcome of the Dreyfus case and the complete rehabilitation of the falsely accused Jewish captain. The historic document was published on January 13, 1898. February 23 of the same year the great novelist was sentenced by a military court and on July 19 he fled from France and entered upon his years of exile in England.

## *Truth is On the March*

Fifty years ago, after Captain Alfred Dreyfus had been sentenced for the second time, Emile Zola published his open letter to the President of the French Republic, exposing the guilt of the French judges, the army, the corrupt politicians, and the venal press and proclaiming the innocence of the Jewish captain.

The storm unleashed against Zola by the forces of French reaction was unprecedented in the history of any nation. Paris was in a lynching mood. Mass demonstrations were held in front of his house, and the street resounded with cries of "Down with Zola." The newspapers took up the slogan: "We must fight Zola and defend the honor of the army." But Zola, supported only by a small group of his friends, continued his struggle undaunted in the face of the most violent persecutions. In the end, however, Zola's prophecy: "Truth is on the march and nothing will stop it" (*La vérité est en marche et rien ne l'arrêtera*) came true.

Ten years ago, on January 13, 1938, when the shadow of the second world war was hanging over Europe, this writer attended in Paris a celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the publication of *J'Accuse*.

Several hundred French artists, and intellectuals gathered in a small hall in the Latin Quarter. Among them were some of Zola's friends, and his daughter, Madame Denis Leblond-Zola, who had helped her father in composing the famous document. On the platform sat Pierre Dreyfus, the captain's son, who recently died in an airplane crash on his way to New York, and Zola's former publisher, the grey-haired eighty-year-old Fasquelle.

At the most difficult moments in Zola's life, when he was almost completely isolated, when many of his closest friends deserted him, and the newspaper *Figaro* refused to print his articles about the Dreyfus case, Fasquelle stood by the courageous novelist. He published Zola's articles in the form of pamphlets and for some time even served as his bodyguard. During Zola's trial by a military tribunal, Fasquelle accompanied him daily to the courtroom in order to protect him against violence.

## *Zola and Alphonse Daudet*

In 1894, when the Dreyfus case began, Zola was in Rome gathering material for the second volume of his trilogy, *Lourdes, Rome, and Paris*. At that time even the French liberals did not doubt the guilt of Dreyfus, who had been sentenced by the highest military court.

A year later, on January 16, 1895, the day after the public degradation of the captain in the courtyard of the military academy in Paris, Zola was visiting Alphonse Daudet, the great French writer. At dinner Daudet spoke with great indignation of the disgraceful scene that he had witnessed. He described how the epaulettes had been torn off the frightened captain and his sword broken. Leon Daudet, Alphonse's son, who later became a leader of the French royalists, but at that time was revolutionary-minded and belonged to an anarchist youth organization, was aroused by his father's account and uttered some sharp words against the French military caste.

#### *Zola Meets Bernard Lazare*

Before the Dreyfus case Zola had never been interested in politics. He was at the height of his successful literary career and remained aloof from any kind of social activity. But the Dreyfus case drew him into the political struggle. This came about through the instrumentality of Bernard Lazare, a distinguished writer, who was the first to take up the cudgels for Captain Dreyfus and published a pamphlet proving his innocence on the basis of documents. This pamphlet was published in Belgium, because no French printer dared to print it, and even the Belgian printer refused the use of his name.

When Bernard Lazare brought his pamphlet to Jean Jaures, the great Socialist leader received him coldly. To the Socialists, Lazare was above all a member of the Rothschild family. Berthelot, the great French scientist, who was known as a liberal, also refused to support the campaign for the revision of the Dreyfus case. Then Lazare appealed to Zola who had just won great popularity by his trilogy, *Lourdes, Rome, and Paris*.

Zola's friends warned him against this "adventurous undertaking," that would endanger his literary career. But Zola ignored their advice and threw himself headlong into the struggle.

#### *The "Syndicate"*

He began his public campaign by a series of articles in the conservative and much-respected *Figaro*. These articles were published on November 25, December 1, and December 5, 1897. The third article, entitled "The Syndicate" aroused such a storm of protest from readers, that the new editors of the newspaper decided to cease publication of the series, in which Zola revealed the secret machinations behind the Dreyfus case. The third article was an answer to the reactionary French press which accused the supporters of Dreyfus of having sold themselves to the "Jewish money syndicate."

Zola was thus deprived of a public organ. It was then that Fasquelle came to his aid, publishing his articles in the form of pamphlets, namely, *An Open Letter to the French Youth*, and *An Open Letter to France*.

On January 11, 1898, Zola was now deeply shaken by the shocking action of the French highest court which acquitted the spy and traitor Captain Esterhazy, the chief intriguer in the Dreyfus case. It was then that he wrote his third "open letter" to the President of the French Republic.

When this letter had been printed in the form of a pamphlet and was ready for release, Zola at the last moment decided to try to reach more readers by publishing it in a newspaper. He appealed to the publishers of the newly founded *L'Aurore*. The manager of this newspaper was Vaughan, a former leader of the Paris Commune; its political editor was Clemenceau.

#### *Origin of the title "J'Accuse"*

In pamphlet form this historic manifesto was entitled "An Open Letter to Felix Faure, President of the Republic." It was Clemenceau who thought of calling it "J'Accuse." All the editors of *L'Aurore* including Clemenceau and Vaughan, were gathered in the paper's office on the narrow Rue de Croissant. The manifesto

made a tremendous impression on everyone, but Clemenceau said that the title was too weak for such an important document. He took the pamphlet and suddenly cried out the word that recurs in the text: "I accuse." "That will be the title," Clemenceau decided and immediately sat down to make up a poster announcing the publication of Zola's historic document for the following day.

The posters were put up that night and the following morning 300,000 copies of *L'Aurore* were sold. The old-fashioned rotary press worked without interruption. All Paris read with baited breath Zola's indictment which concludes with the following words:

"I have only one passion—to fight. I desire it only for the sake of mankind which has suffered so much and is entitled to happiness. My impassioned protest is only the cry of my soul. Let them dare to try me, and let the trial be carried on in broad daylight. I am waiting!"

Zola's letter in which he attacked a number of generals as accomplices in a frame-up aroused a terrible storm in the Chamber of Deputies. Count de Min, cavalry officer and reactionary deputy, prepared an interpellation. But who was to defend the courageous writer in parliament? France was then on the eve of elections, and the majority of the Socialist deputies thought that participation in the Dreyfus case might be harmful to the party.

In justification of this practical attitude, Alexandre Millerand, one of the leaders of the French Socialist Party, declared: "Zola is not even a Socialist. The Socialist Party has no reason for defending this bourgeois writer." But this remark of

Millerand's was violently criticized by Jules Guesde, the theoretician of French socialism, who explained: "Zola's letter is the greatest revolutionary event of our time." Jean Jaures supported Guesde and was the first to take the floor in defense of Zola.

Count de Min brought in his motion demanding that Zola should be tried for insulting the army. The Minister of War and Premier supported Count de Min's motion. Thus Zola and the publisher of *L'Aurore* were indicted and put on trial.

Zola was sentenced to one year, and the publisher to four months in prison. In addition, each of them was fined 3,000 francs, a considerable sum at that time.

But the march of the truth could no longer be stopped. Zola's letter shocked the conscience of the French people. The struggle for the rehabilitation of Captain Dreyfus lasted for eight more years. But Zola, who died in 1902, saw the triumph of justice; by that time Dreyfus had been brought back from Devil's Island, and the French government had recognized that a judicial crime had been committed against him, although the struggle for the honorable rehabilitation of the captain was ended only by the official ceremony of July 20, 1906, when Dreyfus in the same courtyard where he had been degraded, was promoted to the rank of major and decorated with the Legion of Honor.

Today, fifty years after the publication of *J'Accuse*, as we look back at the tragic events that filled this half-century, we are struck by the aptness of the words with which Anatole France concluded his speech on Zola's grave: "He embodied, for one moment, the conscience of mankind."

## VOICE OF THE HAGANAH

By JUDAH M. TURKAT

If I should die fighting for the Holy Land  
Lay me beside a lake of lilies  
Or a field with maturing wheat.

Let bellflowers support my head  
And jasmine decorate my brow.  
Let tender violets bend over me  
And blazing poppies murmur at my feet.

O do not mark my grave  
With sign, monument or King David Shield.

But wrap my body in a prayer shawl  
As you would a Sage or Gaon.  
Place in my hands a rifle or sten gun  
With a belt full of bullets  
That I may advance again  
With Israel's valiant men  
On the road to our Zion.

---

## SONG OF THE HAGANAH

By JUDAH M. TURKAT

The Arabs hold the land  
The British rule the sea  
The Mufti and his gang  
Control geography.

On a camel caravan  
We shall cross the sea  
To land in Jerusalem  
Upon the Mufti's knee.  
O such effrontery.

Hey, Arab, if you want to be  
A bird without a feather  
A fish in the Dead Sea  
Go ride the British Wagon  
Or climb the Mufti's tree.



# Principles for Jewish Centers

By WERNER J. CAHNMAN

THE NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD (J.W.B.) is well known for the activities of its Army and Navy Division in war time, but its beneficial function in peace time is still much too little appreciated. This peace-time function is organized around the Jewish Center Division which guides and assists 321 Jewish Community Centers and Y.M. & Y.W.H.A.'s throughout the width and breadth of the United States and Canada. If one considers that out of a total income in 1947 of \$1,238,612.50 little more than half a million dollars was assigned to the work of the center Division, while, at the same time, millions were spent for civil defense work of questionable efficiency, one cannot help but feel that the Jewish Community in America needs more information about the constructive efforts which are being expended by the Center Division of J.W.B. in the field of group work and leisure time activities for large sections of the Jewish population, particularly the youth. It is true that the above mentioned sum does not include all the dollars and cents which are spent locally for the maintenance of individual centers, but one may say that the more the movement expands on the local level, the more it stands in need of the national services of men and women of the first order and capacity. This is duly emphasized in the J.W.B. survey which has just been published. In the following remarks, we do not propose to discuss the Survey itself but rather some of the aspects of the lively controversy which developed around the survey and the principles for Jewish Centers which emerged from the argument.

It is in the light of these considerations that the Annual meeting of J.W.B. in Chicago will long stand out as a milestone, and perhaps as a turning point, in the history of the Jewish Center movement in America. The protagonists, although they were not present at the meeting, were Prof. Oscar J. Janowsky, of the Dept. of History at the College of the City of New York, as the director and author of the survey, and Prof. Louis Wirth, of the Dept. of Sociology at the University of Chicago, as the director and co-author of the "Independent Study" which critically reviewed the survey; but many men and women, laymen, center workers, and rabbis, participated in argument and counter-argument throughout the country. The outcome, as embodied in the principles which were adopted at the annual meeting, marks a victory both for Jewish self-assertion and democratic liberties. However, it was a victory achieved in an awkward, roundabout, and inadvertent fashion because of the errors both in method and in judgment which were committed by Prof. Janowsky in his capacity as director and author of the J.W.B. survey. Therefore, before analyzing the adopted principles, we must devote some brief remarks to the 1947 annual meeting of the National Council of J.W.B., which took place in Pittsburgh, and to some extent to the survey itself. For a more intensive discussion of the survey, however, this writer must refer to articles which appeared in the *Reconstructionist* of April 29, 1948 and the *National Jewish Post* of May 7, 1948 respectively as well as to a final evalu-

ation which is to appear shortly in the *Menorah Journal*.

## II

The meeting of the National Council at Pittsburgh had been confronted not so much with the survey itself as with the "recommendations" of the Survey Commission. However, as it turned out, most of these recommendations were not based on findings but rather on the predilections and prejudices of the director of the survey and, presumably, of some members of the Commission. As a matter of fact, if one knew these predilections and prejudices, one could have formulated the recommendations in advance of the survey. While this was sufficient reason to arouse apprehension and discontent, the way in which the recommendations were railroaded through the Pittsburgh convention aggravated the situation still further. To believe that one has won a major victory, if one has forced one's highly personal point of view down the throat of a reluctant opposition by the devices of majority rule, is a mistake which, as it seems, has become all too common in Jewish life. This newly fashionable take-it-or-leave-it philosophy has proved disastrous more than once. Following along this road, one is merely led into a series of pyrrhic victories, foreshadowing ultimate defeat. Such is particularly true if the opposition, while numerically a minority, is never the less a formidable one in terms of the social and political influence which it wields and hence can refuse to "take" as well as to "leave" in favor of a stiff fight. Besides, in a movement such as the Jewish center movement, which is based on the assumption that unity in Jewish life is a worthwhile thing, no decision in matters of principle should be forced to a vote if a sizeable minority objects. In such an instance, the slower processes of rational persuasion are likely to yield more satisfactory results.

Moreover, one may doubt whether a statement of principles was the thing that

was called for under the circumstances. The Jewish center movement, as the survey itself has revealed, is composed of many strains representing divergent opinions and strivings for goals which are not easily reconcilable. This follows from the principle of Jewish unity in a democratic society. In addition, in a time, such as ours, which is one of rapid social change, even the individuals within each one of these strains are simultaneously attracted by various sets of values which, logically, may seem mutually exclusive. In the state of bewilderment in which they find themselves they have a longing for the anchorage that "principles" promise to afford to those who shrink from unpleasant realities. However, in the process of formulating these principles, they will ultimately come to comprehend that the realities have a way of persisting in the face of principles while the principles fail if they are not in accord with reality.

Either they are so onesidedly formulated that they threaten to split the leadership and to alienate the clientele or, if an effort is made to blur the edge of explosive issues, they tend to become dilatory and vague. The first alternative characterizes the situation in which the Jewish center movement found itself after the Pittsburgh meeting. The second alternative was barely avoided in Chicago.

The issue which threatened to split the movement after Pittsburgh was the one of "Jewish content". To be sure, more than 76% of the respondents to the attitude questionnaire of the survey and a corresponding number of those who voted at the Pittsburgh meeting declared themselves of the opinion that Jewish content should be emphasized in the Jewish center, but this statement needs interpretation. The survey itself remarks that "the majority of the centers do identify themselves with Jewish life but do not appear to comprehend the full implications." In reality, nobody knew just what was meant by the catch-all phrase of

"Jewish content." A widespread opinion holds that the physical congregation of Jews constitutes the phenomenon which renders the Jewish center a Jewish institution. It may well be that this is all that "Jewish content" meant to numerous respondents of the survey attitude questionnaire. Somewhat less numerous but more vociferous are those for whom two leading social workers in New York, Graenum Berger and Harold Murray, are the principal spokesmen. They emphasize that a Jewish content program in the Jewish center must strive for the realization of the prophetic ideals of peace and justice for all. To them, "Jewish content" is identical with "social action."

Some others feel that Jewish education and holiday celebrations are of the essence, if it comes to "Jewish content," but numerous rabbis are of the opinion that these activities are the province of the synagogue and not of the center. Among the latter group was found the principal speaker of the Chicago convention, the late Rabbi Joshua Loth Liebman, himself a member of the Survey Commission. He thought that center and synagogue could well cooperate, if the center were to cater to the "social needs" of the clientele while the synagogue cared for their "spiritual needs." This was coupled with great praise of the Janowsky report. However, the survey report itself maintains that "the term 'Jewish content' embraces the totality of Jewish spiritual and cultural interests and needs." The curious conclusion emerges that, taken at its face value, Rabbi Liebman's position seemed much nearer the Boards of some Settlement Houses than to those who believe Jewish content fundamental to the Jewish center.

It was the challenge of the survey to ascertain the strength and validity of these positions in terms of actual and potential programs, to show that each one of them, if not carried to its extreme, has a place in a democratically conceived Jewish center movement and, if principles

must be formulated, to do it in such fashion as to give expression to an inclusive philosophy of the Jewish center field. The challenge was not met. Particularly, it should have been demonstrated that the philosophy which maintains that the Jewish center should be an institution of Jewish survival is by no means incompatible with the philosophy which holds that the purpose of the Jewish center is to cater to the needs of the Jewish individual. As a matter of fact, no institution can possibly survive which does not serve the needs of the individuals of which it is composed. This lesson of the old-style orthodox "shul," which was redundant with "content" but miserably lacking in "approach," was entirely lost on the J.W.B. survey and on the recommendations laid before the meeting at Pittsburgh.

### III

During the year following the Pittsburgh meeting a discussion took place in the Jewish center field in the course of which it was found that while there was satisfaction regarding the opportunity to have one's say on the subject and widespread approval of many of the recommendations put forth in the survey, there was also strong opposition to the manner in which an honestly held but factually unfounded philosophy of Jewish life in America was to be imposed upon the constituent agencies. The most potent group among the opposition was composed of members of the Boards of some of the largest centers in the metropolitan section of New York, such as Bronx House, the 92nd Street Y.M. and Y.W.H.A., the Educational Alliance, and the Jewish Association of Neighborhood Centers; this group was the one that sponsored the "Independent Study" which was advised by Prof. Louis Wirth of the University of Chicago, Prof. Oscar Handlin of Harvard University, Prof. Arnold M. Rose of Washington University in St. Louis, and Elliot Cohen, the Editor of *Commentary*. There were apprehensions, considering

the composition of this group. As it turned out, the stand taken by the opposition was so well attuned to a general feeling of uneasiness in Jewish center circles that the statement of principles on Jewish center purposes which was adopted by the annual meeting of the National Council of J.W.B. in Chicago was capable of restoring the balance of forces and hence reflects more accurately than did the Pittsburgh recommendations the actual state of affairs in the Jewish center movement. It may even be contended that the pendulum, having been pushed too far in one direction, swung back all the more vigorously in the other. However that may be, the outcome is a positive achievement.

The most irksome feature of the recommendations which were before the Pittsburgh meeting was contained in the preamble to what was then Recommendation I, concerning a statement of principles in the Jewish center field. It was proposed there that "after an interval of one year, the statement of principles should be adopted, with such modifications as may be deemed necessary, by a majority decision of the National Council" and that "thereafter, approval of and compliance with the stipulated principles should be a condition of new, and after not more than three years, of continued affiliation with the J.W.B." In Article IV of the statement of principles, as adopted in Chicago, the word "compliance" is replaced by the word "consideration" and the continued affiliation of agencies now within the J.W.B. is not conditioned even on this requirement. Joseph Willen, of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, remembering the intolerant atmosphere which surrounded his youth, made an impassioned plea against the adoption even of this moderate formula, but after an equally impassioned plea of the chairman of the Jewish Center Division of J.W.B., Philipp M. Klutznik of Chicago, the majority decided in favor of the reformulated text. Under the circumstances,

this should be hailed as a victory for the positively Jewish forces.

The same may be said about the adoption of Article I which opens with the statement that "Jewish content is fundamental to the Jewish center." The original version had stated that "primary attention" should be given to Jewish content. This version was aggressive in tone and impossible of fulfillment. The new formula states an incontestable principle but avoids embarking upon a crusade. It incorporates Jewish content into the total program of the Jewish Center which "seeks to develop and enrich human personality and group association" rather than to set it aside as a separate shrine.

Another fortunate decision was taken in regard to Article II, although the vote was too close to make the victors feel entirely happy. The corresponding article of last year said that "while participation in the Jewish Center should be open to all inhabitants of the local community, the establishment and/or maintenance of non-sectarian agencies is not the responsibility of the Jewish center movement." This negative formula has been turned positive, so that it now reads: "The Jewish Center should fulfil its Jewish purpose, although participation in the Jewish Center is open to all inhabitants of the community." It should be observed that the first half of this sentence obliges neighborhood centers and settlement houses, if they choose to remain within the National Jewish Welfare Board, to the observance of a Jewish program while the second half makes it abundantly clear that dedication to a Jewish purpose in no way requires the exclusion of non-Jews from center activities. The objection to the formula arose because the text which read at first that participation "may be open" to all inhabitants was subsequently replaced by the version "is open," as it stands now. Southern member agencies were fearful of being drawn into a racial controversy on this score. However, the adopted position is entirely



proper, both from the point of view of eternal Jewish values and from the point of temporary expediency.

Not much need to be said about Article III which is most excellently phrased and which was adopted without protracted argument. It enumerates the functions of the Jewish Center as an agency of Jewish identification, as a common meeting ground for all Jews, as an agency of personality development, as an agency furthering the democratic way of life and as an agency which assists in the integration of the individual Jew, as well as of the Jewish group, into the total American community. It draws the conclusion that these functions require the application of suitable methods and the training of the professional leadership in understanding and meeting the interests and needs of Jewish individuals, Jewish groups, and the Jewish community. The adoption of this article should be a matter of congratulation to the National Council of the National Jewish Welfare Board.

A final word must be devoted to the theory of the "cultural supplement," as pronounced by Prof. Janowsky in his comment to the recommendations of the survey. This theory, if in attenuated form, is incorporated into the preamble of the Chicago principles. The theory of the cultural supplement holds that American Jews are identified with every phase of

American life, while they are Jews by way of supplement to it. This is a second generation theory, making a virtue out of a schizophrenic calamity. To be sure, the preamble shies away from the harshness of the theory of the cultural supplement as originally formulated, but retains the eggshells of this theory still too visibly. It adds the aspects of life which concern us as Jews to the identification which we feel with America. It should be understood that this formula continues to place Jewish life in America outside the orbit of Americanism and hence renders "assistance in the integration of the individual Jew, as well as of the Jewish group, into the total American community", as stated in Article III of the adopted Principles on Jewish Center Purposes. I predict that the preamble will be modified in the future, when it has become abundantly clear that Jewish life in America is American life lived by American Jews in the light of Jewish values and aspirations, not Jewish life "in addition" to American life. If this were not so, the essence of American democracy would be lost. At any rate, whatever the obstacles within the Jewish fold and outside of it, the Jewish center movement is unalterably dedicated to the furtherance of the democratic way of life. It is good to know that this course was reaffirmed at the meetings in Chicago.

---

*"The greatest threat that confronts us is that all our attention remains upon the outward foe: the Fascist, for instance, and that we ignore the foe in us, of which the outward enemy is a symptom. As if, when a house began to fall, we were to blame the individual bricks that crumbled, and not the architect's false plans, not the builder's faulty construction.*

*"So long as we continue to see only the enemy outside, we shall learn nothing. More millions of men may bleed to death, more hundreds of ancient cities may blow to rubble: we shall still learn nothing. Only when we succeed in interiorizing our attention shall we stand upon the threshold of creative knowledge and may this world disaster become a dawn."*

WALDO FRANK, *The Jew In Our Day*



*Intercepted*

ISAC FRIEDLANDER

# MIDWESTERN COMMENTARY

by

ELMER GERTZ

EVERYONE WHO HAS BEEN INVOLVED IN THE struggle against bigotry and reaction has participated in innumerable meetings and conferences. Like Hamlet, we have been incapacitated for action—"sicklied o'er (as we are) by the pale cast of thought." We have talked endlessly with each other and to ourselves. We have become slaves of words, words, words. From time to time, we rebel and make promises to each other, phrased laconically: "No more meetings. No more speeches." Then we proceed to break these promises.

Each time a new conference is announced, we are sustained by the hope that it will be something different. We felt that way when the Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination announced a Work Conference on Human Relations, to be held at Camp Bowen in Waukegan, early in June. The conference did, in fact, turn out to be more productive than most. I am convinced that it already has had far-reaching results.

An imposing list of specialists in human relations was invited to participate. It was hoped that otherwise busy and harassed people would welcome a respite in the country, while working on the problems to which they were dedicated. Seventy-five individuals representing forty-five organizations were there. Many who should have been there were not. I suspect that next year the attendance will be much better; for this country confer-

ence will surely become an institution of the Chicago area. It is to be hoped that next year, as suggested by Father Daniel M. Cantwell, more religious leaders will be present. Even more, it is to be hoped that many ordinary citizens will be there. Lay participation will give the professionals greater understanding of how the ordinary person looks at things.

The conference, for one thing, was an object lesson in decent living. Whites and blacks and Orientals, Jews, Catholics, and assorted Protestants, men and women of all ages and sundry occupations, lived together continuously for two days; and no one contracted moral tetanus or any other dire disease. Even in the midst of strong differences of viewpoint, there was goodwill and good sense.

Among the organizations represented, there were the Chicago Urban League, the Conference of Jewish Women's Organizations, the Anti-Defamation League, the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, American Brotherhood, Catholic Labor Alliance, Council of Social Agencies, University of Chicago, Public Housing Association, South Side Planning Board, Japanese-American Citizens League, Chicago Boys Clubs, Roosevelt College.

The conference consisted of sessions on strategy in lessening discrimination in employment, housing, education; financing human relations organizations; involving lay participation in human rela-

tions organizations; helping the church and the labor movement fight discrimination; organizing the neighborhood for human relations; and group therapy to reduce prejudice and discrimination. The proceedings, assembled in Dr. Homer A. Jack's usual more than competent form, are available upon request. I strongly urge readers of the CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM to write to Dr. Jack (123 West Madison St., Chicago, Illinois) for copies.

In each work group, there were a leader, a recorder, resource leaders, and an observer. The leader stirred up discussions, kept the participants within bounds, prevented mere speech-making. The resource leaders were technical experts, like Thomas H. Wright of the Commission on Human Relations, George Nesbit of the Public Housing Administration, and Stella Counselbaum of the Anti-Defamation League, who stepped in when facts and figures were wanted. The recorder was a sort of super-secretary who reported the proceedings in an integrated form. The observer was a person designated to stand aloof, like Jehovah, and to advise the group as to how it was acquitting itself, particularly if it was straying from its assigned tasks.

Each group would first list hurriedly the various problems and arrange them in an order of priority; then it would arrive at general conclusions as to the state of affairs in its field; finally, it would make recommendations for an action program in specific terms. All of the recommendations added together give a guide for the organizations and individuals desirous of doing something to make this community safe for human diversity.

Here are some of the items on the action agenda:

1. City, state and Federal F. E. P. C. laws, adequately phrased and adequately enforced. This involves a better organized and better functioning over-all citizens group to direct strategy.

2. A real inter-cultural educational program in the public schools, high schools

and colleges, with particular emphasis on the need for adult education. This involves more than general good-will speech-making. It includes heterogeneous school populations and equal opportunities for students and teachers of all creeds and colors.

3. An ordinance to insure Fair Housing Practices. This spells out what is already implicit in the city-state housing program. As these words are appearing in print, the actual campaign is under way to secure the enactment of the proposed ordinance.

One might list the other items on the program, but they will become increasingly apparent as the election nears. Thank God, sometimes, for a Presidential election!

—□—□—□—

WHEN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT outlawed the enforcement of restrictive covenants, the more optimistic people of our kind assumed that it marked the end of all organized efforts to enforce a pattern of residential segregation. Realistic people knew that the historic decisions simply marked the beginning of the fight against housing discrimination, and not the end of it. Newspapers all over the country soon carried reports of renewed activities by realtors and so-called improvement associations. These were the overt expression of much more of a *sub rosa* nature. I was in Detroit shortly after the opinions were released and there I saw an article spread across an entire page of a daily paper in which ways and means of circumventing the decision were discussed. Then when I returned to Chicago, I found that neighborhood groups, particularly in the always tense Woodlawn area, had taken the path of resistance, rather than acceptance. This betokens powerful struggles in the near future.

—□—□—□—

In the midst of these local developments, the National Association for the Advance-



ment of Colored People (N. A. A. C. P.) had its national convention in Kansas City. The principal item on the agenda was the best procedure for implementing the Supreme Court decisions.

There were present at the convention many of the lawyers and laymen who had made possible the decisions. During the formal sessions and even more during the informal conversations, the implications and strategy were discussed, random hints sometimes meaning more than the carefully thought out analysis. Many of the delegates recalled that the low point in the morale of those fighting against restrictive covenants was the denial of the right to appeal (*certiorari*) several years before in the Mays case. It was then that the N. A. A. C. P.s called a conference in Chicago of those who were not ready to give up the fight. It was that conference which worked out the strategy which ultimately proved to be successful.

The convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis took place at the same time the N. A. A. C. P. was meeting. Walter White, the famous Executive Secretary of the N. A. A. C. P., was invited to address the rabbis and Dr. Abraham Feldman, President of the Central Conference, was invited to talk to the N. A. A. C. P. This was more than a friendly gesture. It was symbolical of the close tie between all minority groups. It will not be forgotten that the first white organization which intervened against restrictive covenants was the Chicago Division of the American Jewish Congress; and in the briefs of the United States Supreme Court, there are the names of other-Jewish organizations and individuals.

—□—□—□—

EDWIN R. EMBREE, THE FAMOUS PRESIDENT of the Rosenwald Fund, left Chicago following the wind-up of the activities of the Fund. He resigned as Chairman of the city's Commission on Human Relations which he had headed from the out-

set and which he had helped to make one of the outstanding race relations groups in the country. Mayor Kennelly appointed to succeed Mr. Embree the well-known Catholic lay leader, Augustine J. Bowe. At the time of his appointment, Mr. Bowe was the chairman of the Committee on Law and Order which is part of the Commission. He is chief counsel in connection with the appeal of the *Sentinel* and its editors and publishers against the outrageous jury verdicts recently rendered against them. He and his wife have been among the most active leaders of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. He will undoubtedly carry with him, as he undertakes his new assignment, the good wishes of all elements of the Community except the professional bigots.

—□—□—□—

THE ROSENWALD FUND TERMINATION CEREMONIES were as impressive and at the same time as delightful as one could desire. The audiences for the various events consisted of most of those whose names are familiar to all who are working in the field of human relations, men and women from all parts of the country. Indeed, Gunnar Myrdal, the famous author of *An American Dilemma*, came from Sweden to make prophecies as to what we might expect in the years to come. On the same seminar was W. E. B. DuBois, the dean of Negro scholars. In his usual unemotional manner, Dr. DuBois gave the essential facts, the ups and downs, of Negro history during the last quarter century. Robert C. Weaver, who is the successor of the great DuBois in scholarship, chaired the seminar, which was followed by tea and cocktails. It was then that we talked informally in small groups about the problems of living together—now with Marshall Field, then with Walter White, Charles Houston, Mitchell Dawson, K. M. Landis II, Thomas Wright, or others. In the evening

there was a dinner during which speech-making was minimized. Edwin Embree himself spoke, as did Lillian Smith, author of *Strange Fruit*. Lessing Rosenwald said a few words for the family. But, for the rest, several representative recipients of Rosenwald Fellowships gave stirring examples of their work. Pearl Primus danced in her heady, intoxicating manner; Natalie Hinderas played gloriously at the piano; Pauline Phelps sang in deep, rich tones; Sterling Brown and Langston Hughes gave characteristic specimens of their poems and prose. Here was tangible evidence that the Fellowships have enriched the culture of this land. Many others carry on now in the tradition of this Prince of Israel.

—□—□—□—

WHO IS THERE WHO DOES NOT TAKE DELIGHT in the columns of K. M. Landis, II, which appear in the Chicago *Sun-Times*? He attended the annual race relations institute at Fisk University, held during July in Nashville, Tennessee, and wrote a series of inimitably bright columns about the discussions in which white and colored delegates participated. Conditions in Chicago and other Northern cities were high on the agenda. Dr. Joseph D. Lohman, University of Chicago sociologist and official of the Rosenwald Fund, pointed to a map of racial violence. There were big, ugly blotches everywhere—North, South, East and West. Northerners are often more prejudiced than Southerners, as all who lived through the Sojourner Truth riots in Detroit or the Fernwood Park tensions in Chicago know. The task is to learn to live together—not through general uplift work, but through the development of specific techniques. Dr. Lohman has written a text book for police officers which deals with some of these techniques.

—□—□—□—

I REGRET THAT I WAS UNABLE TO ATTEND the Zionist Convention at Pittsburgh. I

enjoyed the full savor of the convention vicariously through conversations with Nathan D. Kaplan, who is certainly as well qualified as anyone to make comparisons, appraisals, and prophecies. Mr. Kaplan was particularly impressed by the revelation of the growth of the General Zionists and by the inspiring talks delivered at the banquet which wound up the proceedings. He felt that the much heralded opposition was guilty of faulty judgment and really had little to offer. On the basic issues there was no room for great difference of opinion. The task confronting all Zionists and, indeed, all Jews is for each to make his own best contribution towards assuring the survival of Israel. Gradually there will be a determination of the respective roles of the *Yishuv* and of those of us residing elsewhere. As Rabbi Abba Silver has said, Israel will continue to fulfil a purpose for all of us for all time to come. Our devotion to it will never narrow the scope of our Americanism.

—□—□—□—

HERE IS ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF HOW A failure to coordinate fund-raising activities can lead to confusion worse confounded. Various people, in their desire to aid the new nation, pushed plans for Freedom Trains for Israel. New York, Philadelphia and Chicago took the lead in this effort. After an impressive ceremony, seventeen freight cars pulled out of the Chicago station one day in June. The Chicago B'nai B'rith Council was the sponsor. A blessing was bestowed upon the event by the general chairman of the Combined Jewish Appeal. Then it was decided that Freedom Train activities might interfere with the all-important U. J. A. drive. So men and women began pulling in different directions. It was not a pretty picture, and it delighted none of our friends. It will be hard enough to achieve the year's quota without complicating the situation further.

I AM HAPPY TO REPORT THAT MY GOOD Companion in many a civic battle, Rabbi Jacob Weinstein, has been re-elected President of the Chicago Rabbinical Association. It recalled to my mind a luncheon I had with him earlier in the year. Rabbi Weinstein had received a few days previously an Award of Merit from the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations for his great contributions in building a better community. He felt that the award ought to have gone to the civic affairs committee of his congregation. He, as much as any other clergyman of the city, is aware of the responsibilities of truly religious people in building a community in which the eternal verities have a fighting chance to prevail. A citizen of the world, he is deeply cognizant of the problems that transcend denominational limits. At the same time, he is concerned with the special problems of the Jews of Chicago. His leadership of the Chicago Rabbinical Association has helped give that group an increasing awareness of the part it must play if it is to be an effective force.

Of course, the Association deals largely with religious matters; but its interests transcend the theological. During 1947 it helped rally support for the housing bond issues, the Chicago Housing Authority, the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations, the separation of Church and State, and other causes. It is significant, as Rabbi Weinstein told me, that few, if any, Rabbis protested these activities in non-religious spheres. There is a cautious minority in the Association as in the Jewish Community itself, which feels that the rabbinate should be hesitant about intervening in secular matters; but the prevailing viewpoint is that certain problems are of such importance that the clergy must speak out in the fulfillment of the obligation to give moral leadership.

It is gratifying that the Association numbers among its seventy members rabbis of the reform, conservative and various traditional or orthodox professions. The latter groups are not as well

represented numerically as the less orthodox congregations. It should be remembered that each of the groups has its own special association, and there are sharp differences of viewpoint on dietetics, ritual and similar matters.

The Chicago Rabbinical Association was founded as far back as 1873, but it does not have any offices of its own or any staff. Nor does it have any financial resources. Only a nominal dues (\$7.50 per year!) is paid by members, and the Association functions largely through the president, secretary, and various committees. Sometimes special work, as, for example, Boy Scout activities, is farmed out to other organizations. The full membership meets monthly and the executive committee meets oftener. The effectiveness of the organization is largely dependent upon the interest, energy, and skill of the leadership of the moment. Yet, the organization aspires to speak for the Jewish community. Rabbi Weinstein and others feel that the Chicago Rabbinical Association, rather than any of the defense organizations, or any one rabbi, is in the best position to express the viewpoint of Jewry. Rabbi Weinstein says this in no proprietary spirit, as the president of a group, but with the full realization that there is a natural dignity and effectiveness when the rabbinate speaks as a body.

Rabbi Weinstein, like the members of his Association, regrets the lack of real unity and cohesiveness in the community. He thinks that there is too much in the way of organizational bickering and that what is needed is a community council. This is needed, not merely because of the duplication of efforts in the financial drives, but even more because of the rivalries and cross-purposes in matters of social action. He says that with the birth of the Jewish state in Palestine, there is greater possibility of achieving a community council here. He believes that the great ideological chasm between Zionists and non-Zionists can now be bridged and

that both groups can work together to a greater extent than ever.

It was significant to me that much of my conversation with Rabbi Weinstein concerned such things as political action, the prevention of war, the strengthening of family life, and everything except what is narrowly Jewish. This betokened to me, as it did to Rabbi Weinstein, that the Jewish community will realize its greatest opportunities if it recognizes, even while it is working to solve its own problems, that the Jew finds redemption largely in the common questions and answers of the day.

—□—□—□—

AS WAS TO BE EXPECTED, MAYOR HUBERT T. Humphrey of Minneapolis took the lead in fighting for a real civil rights plank, in the Democratic platform. Whether the party wins or loses, it has recovered its soul, in the opinion of many observers. As Mayor Humphrey and those of his group prevail, the Democratic Party will once again become what it was in the administration of Roosevelt, the party of those who believe in freedom and

equality. Mayor Humphrey is a very brilliant young man, whose career should be followed by all those who want to observe American politics at its best.

—□—□—□—

THOSE WHO READ THE NOVEL, *FOCUS*, BY Arthur Miller, will recognize the situation which confronted Fred and Lillian Ehrman when they moved into a "restricted" neighborhood in Kenilworth, one of Chicago's beautiful North Shore suburbs. One neighbor waylaid Ehrman and held him for fifteen minutes while threatening him. The wife of the "gentleman" threw branches at Mrs. Ehrman while Mrs. Ehrman was standing on her porch, and said: "You should live in the Ghetto." Another neighbor turned the garden hose on Mrs. Ehrman's mother and three times flooded the property. Lights flashed on the Ehrman house and telephone calls awakened them during late hours. But it was all a mistake. The neighbors did not know that the Ehrmans are not Jewish. The Ehrmans, who failed to appreciate the joke, have sued for \$100,000 damages. Good luck to them!

---

*"Though admitted into the Greek-Orthodox faith when a mere infant, Rubinstein was painfully aware of his Jewish origin all his life. As a youth struggling for achievement and fame, he learned that twice as much was required of him as of a Christian. Throughout his life, abroad and in his own country, he was unpleasantly reminded of his ancestral faith. He smarted at these allusions, whether by opponents who maliciously hinted at his Jewishness or by admirers who patronizingly remarked 'we don't like Jews, but that doesn't mean Anton Grigorovich.' When Alexander III conferred upon him the honorary title of Exzellenz, Anton said to his mother: 'I have a presentiment that I shall need this Exzellenz some day against the very powers that gave it to me. For all your baptism at Berdichev, we are Jews, you and I and sister Sophie.'"*

LOUIS GREENBERG, *The Jews in Russia*



## NEW YORK NOTES

By VERO

**R**EVIEWING THE LAST QUARTER of the Jewish Year, I regret that, with all my innate optimism, I cannot start this fourth installment of New York Notes in a mood of happiness. For it is not difficult for me to imagine that my name is Leroy Hutson, and that I am a college-graduated Negro engineer who has just bought for himself and his family a bungalow at Asbury Park, New Jersey. Well, the Hutsons had hardly moved in when anonymous phone calls inquired whether the "Niggers" intended to stay. When the reply was "Yes," the caller hung up. The same night a large wooden cross flared 50 yards from the little house—and Hutson knew immediately what he was up against. The Klan was riding again, just a few miles south of the world's most progressive metropolis! Hutson called for police protection, but, in order to be completely safe, he also begged Negro friends, World War II veterans like himself, to come down to his home, armed with rifles. Mr. Hutson also taught his wife to use a shotgun—for an emergency. These 24-hour vigils went on for weeks. . . .

A New York newspaperman interviewed Hutson's neighbors who are all white people. The majority abhor the Klan's action and the implied threat, siding as they are with the local paper which, in an editorial, condemned the KKK unequivocally: "Two sticks fashioned in the form of a cross and a match in the hand of an unthinking man can start a conflagration beyond his power

and all his fellows to extinguish. Hitler found it so." But a woman defended the Klan, saying that it was formed "to protect white southern womanhood from rape." Then she added, thoughtfully: "Besides, when Niggers move in, property values deteriorate."

There must be others in and around the city who think like that bigot. But the Negro veterans at the Asbury Park servicemen's club who keep a watchful eye on the Hutson property, are not worried:

"The Klan could scare people twenty years ago but this is 1948. We've been to war and we are not afraid to fight for our rights."

△ △ △

**T**HERE ARE OTHER PEOPLE, too, who carefully watch those who, through their evil deeds, might infringe upon our Civil Liberties. In this respect we wish to congratulate Gerald W. Johnson on his brilliant review of *Hollywood on Trial*. From a discussion of Gordon Kahn's report on the ten screen writers and producers prosecuted and persecuted by the Un-American Activities Committee, the review, appearing in New York's conservative *Herald Tribune*, developed into an unforgettable attack on all who would like to put the clock back. We should like to reprint the review *in toto*, as it was much talked about in Gotham, but we must limit ourselves:

... The real story of *Hollywood on Trial* is not what happened to the ten scriveners, but what happened to you and me. We may have been cherishing the notion that even if Patton is dead and Marshall and Eisenhower translated, MacArthur remains in uniform and he alone is man enough to handle ten little writers from Hollywood, if they should undertake to march on Washington, hang Vandenberg, and throw Joe Martin into the Potomac. But it seems that that is an illusion. J. Parnell Thomas assures us that Hollywood is such a menace that it deserves investigation by a Congressional Committee even at cost of shattering our illusions as to what we thought were our rights.

So the business leaves us looking silly indeed. No matter what happens to the writers, the gentleman from New Jersey has made monkeys of all oldfashioned Americans. I for one, don't like it.

△ △ △

I DON'T LIKE THE IDEA that eleven distinguished Americans have been sent to jail merely because they, as board members of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, refused to divulge the names of the people who contributed money for their cause. Howard Fast, the novelist, known to Chicagoans as the author of a fictionalized biography of Governor Peter Altgeld, is one of the eleven who have been punished for being anti-Fascist and for aiding fighters for Republican Spain. *PM*, that has changed its name to *New York Star*, but has not changed its liberal policy, is the only metropolitan paper printing in full Howard Fast's "Open Letter," addressing itself to the American people. Here again we are unhappy to be forced to limit ourselves to a few lines from this unusual letter which, some day, will be required reading in American schools:

That we are going to jail is not a matter of great consequence. We personally accepted these jail sentences rather than surrender our principles and the principles of our nation to the ethics of the Un-American Committee. But the reasons why we go to jail are a matter of tragic consequence to all Americans.

For, with our imprisonment, anti-Fascism becomes a crime under the law of the land. Charity becomes a crime. To aid the sick and

the hungry becomes a crime—if the politics of those you aid are not the politics of the Un-American Committee.

This is the burning, terrible shame of America today. This is what we cannot and will not accept. . . .

△ △ △

IF NEW YORK CITY were to be "cleansed" of all "non-Nordic," non-Protestant elements, in order to please America's Little Hitler, three quarters of the population would have to leave! Hence, it is not surprising that many New Yorkers are furious about the new Displaced Persons Bill, discriminating against Jews and Catholics. "All it does is exclude all Jews," Emanuel Celler, Democrat of New York, exclaimed. Judge Proskauer, president of the American Jewish Committee, declared: "Through ignorance or design, this legislation in effect aims at deliberate exclusion of Jews and, to a lesser extent, of Catholics now languishing in displaced persons camps in Europe." Former Governor Lehmann added his voice to the mounting protests, and the American Slav Congress, with headquarters in New York, characterized the bill as "favoring former Hitler fifth columnists" and constituting "a mockery of the sufferings of the real victims of Nazism and Fascism." Even the ordinarily cautious *New York Times* got angry, particularly over the fact that the bill allows Volksdeutsche to enter the U. S. under German or Austrian quotas, "permitting these persons of German ethnic origin, many of whom had strong Nazi ties, to compete for regular quota numbers with bona fide DPs."

New Yorkers with a good memory for historical facts recalled that, a quarter of a century ago, US legislators anticipated Hitlerism by drafting the Immigration Act of 1924 which was a "racial" law, as it aimed at the restriction of Southern and Eastern European immigration to the USA. Being a Russian, even Alexandra Tolstoy, the distinguished daughter of the famous novelist, belongs

in the category of "undesirable" immigrants, to judge by the yardstick applied by our native "racialists." Now the great old lady, director of New York's Tolstoy Foundation, in an Open Letter to the *New York Times*, challenges those Congressmen who have actually referred to the DP's as "scum."

"What are we afraid of?" she asks. "Don't we have in this country foreigners, immigrants, who are world-famous in many fields, such as music, art, science, aircraft, engineering, etc? Don't we need skilled farmers in this country? I am positive that by admitting those people to the United States we will not lose but gain."

△ △ △

FORTUNATELY, sane reasoning has not completely left the people here on the East Coast. A noted banker and a world-famous scientist are among this minority. Speaking at the first world conference of the Church Peace Union at New York's Town Hall, James P. Warburg, economist and author, made several suggestions that ought to be heeded by our policy makers in Washington, D. C. Mr. Warburg demanded, among other things, that German monopolies be socialized, and big landed estates be broken up: "At present we are following the dangerous direction of trying to rebuild in western Germany a free enterprise economy on the American model. This leads to a restorationist policy which may well return to power the very elements which have in the past made Germany a warrior nation." Mr. Warburg emphasized that we should rid ourselves of the fear of communism and adopt a positive policy for peace, so that we would not be afraid to change the old order in Germany, which is needed if Germany is to become a healthy nation.

Dr. Albert Einstein, who will soon be seventy, is smarter than many much younger men, even in the realm on

foreign politics. In a telephoned message from his home in Princeton, N. J. to a meeting in Carnegie Hall under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, the professor said the United States Government, by its "unyielding refusal" to accept "the suggestion of the Soviet Union for direct negotiations," had sent relations between the countries "into a stage more dangerous than ever." He warned his audience that only "patient and understanding negotiations" between the two countries could restore the "mutual confidence . . . lost in the three calamitous years" since the war's end.

But what was the politicians' comment? "Dr. Einstein talks about things he doesn't understand. He ought to stick to his physics."

△ △ △

THERE IS A BEST-SELLER that never appeared on the list of best-sellers, published regularly by the major Metropolitan papers. Right now I do not mean the Bible—I have a 32-page pamphlet in mind that was written by two New Yorkers several years ago. In order not to keep you waiting any longer, I shall disclose to you that it is the Public Affairs Committee pamphlet, *The Races of Mankind*, written jointly by Professor Ruth Benedict and Dr. Gene Weltfish. Down at the Public Affairs Committee headquarters they told me that the booklet has long passed the million mark, and that there is no reason why it should not hit the two million in due time.

This potent antidote to Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and the ugly outpourings of American-styled Hitlers has done better than many well-advertised books, although, or because, it has been attacked by bigoted Southerners on account of its dispassionate sober treatment of the so-called Negro problem. In order to transmit their message of good-will to the entire American people, the two authors

and their friends created new ways and means. To cater to those less privileged with education, the pamphlet's ideas were turned into a brief moving picture story, "We Are All Brothers" and into an illustrated lecture in musical comedy form, "Meet Your Relatives;" and now poster size "blowups" of Reinhardt's funny yet informative original drawings are available, while the Cranbrook Institute in Michigan developed a portable photo-mural exhibit on the pamphlet.

The most successful ventures in this line are, so far, the "silly symphony" in color, "Brotherhood of Man," and a picture book based on the latter and called *In Henry's Backyard* (published by Henry Schumann, New York). As for the latter book, it started off promisingly with a first printing of 25,000 copies; celebrating Brotherhood Week 1948, a leading electrical manufacturing firm in The Bronx bought 550 copies for its employees. The Southern Conference for Human Welfare, the anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and the American Jewish Committee have been calling the book to the attention of their members. Recently, the first-mentioned organization held a luncheon at a New York hotel in order to honor the authors, Professor Benedict and Dr. Weltfish, for their contributions to inter-racial understanding. Among the speakers was a former Brooklyn policeman who talked about the slums in Brooklyn's Negro section.

△ △ △

THE NATION'S two best-known Reformed Jewish religious schools, the Hebrew Union College of Cincinnati, and the Jewish Institute of Religion, of New York, were merged recently. The consolidation was achieved, a joint announcement said, "to unite for the strengthening and advancement of Judaism in America and throughout the world." The merged institution will maintain schools in Cincinnati and New York with a uniform educational program. The merger saw Dr.

Nelson Glueck, president of the Cincinnati school, become president of the united institution. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, who founded the Jewish Institute in 1922, became president emeritus.

Let us here stop briefly to pay tribute to the New York institution which has given a great deal to world Jewry in the quarter of a century it existed as an independent school. Let me mention such scholars as Israel Abraham, Ismar Elbogen, Joel Blau, Cecil Roth, Salo W. Baron, Zwi Diesendruck, and David Yellin who have taught there; let me praise its library containing nearly 50,000 volumes, and the fine books by the Jewish Institute Press, containing, incidentally, also works by non-Jews, such as the volume on *Pirke Aboth* by that distinguished Britisher, R. Travers Herford.

△ △ △

WE MENTIONED WISE—well, recently hundreds of Americans of all faiths gathered at a New York Hotel luncheon to pay tribute to this veteran pleader for Israel who has devoted fifty years of his life to the battle for Zionism. Many people who revere Wise as a leader of American Jewry and as a fighter for Jeffersonian ideals have forgotten what an important role he has played in the shaping of World Zionism. At the Second Zionist Congress (Basle 1898) Wise, then a young rabbi of New York's Madison Avenue Synagogue, served in the capacity of English secretary. Herzl, fourteen years his senior, was very fond of the brilliant and outspoken young American. In an address, made at a Madison Square Garden meeting in celebration of the establishment of Israel, Dr. Wise recalled episodes from the earlier part of his life:

For the last time I must pour out my heart and tell you that in April 1904, not long before he died, Theodor Herzl, after a meeting of the Actions Committee of the World Zionist Organization, walking with me in the streets of Vienna, said: 'I shall not live to see the Jewish state, but you, Wise, are younger, and you will live to see the Jewish state.' I am here, tonight, to



thank God that Herzl's prophecy has been fulfilled, that you, who are young, and I, who am no longer young, have lived to see, to welcome and to rejoice in the Jewish State. God bless it evermore.

△ △ △

**A**T ALBANY, capital of New York, the State Board of Regents granted recognition, for the first time, to Modern Hebrew as an approved state course of study in the high schools. It appointed a committee to assist the Education Department in the preparation of a syllabus on the subject, and named to the committee was, among others, a friend of the CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM, Dr. Abraham I. Katsh, Professor of Education at New York University. It is interesting to note that an increasing number of public school pupils in New York city—around 4,000—are now studying Hebrew. Pretty soon Regents' examinations in Hebrew will be offered as in the other languages, and pupils studying Hebrew—the official language of the state of Israel—will be eligible for diplomas and scholarship benefits on the same basis as those in other modern languages.

△ △ △

**H**AVE YOU EVER HEARD of Selman A. Waksman? The likelihood is that you haven't—unless you are a microbiologist like Dr. Waksman. From Odessa he came to this country nearly three decades ago, and he is now in charge of the microbiological department of the State Agricultural Experiment station at Rutgers University, New Jersey. Recently the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association honored him for his outstanding work in discovering streptomycin. Made an honorary member, he was told that streptomycin was "one of the outstanding discoveries of the ages." And listen to this message the 60-year-old professor conveyed to the National Tuberculosis Asso-

ciation at New York's Hotel Pennsylvania, after surveying the field of antibiotics:

"One is inclined to become optimistic and assert that before long all human and animal diseases, and possibly also plant diseases, will be combated if not completely eliminated."

This, he admitted, was an optimistic point of view, indeed, but, he added, an impartial examination of recent developments in isolating soil-growing developments and applying them to disease in man "have fully served to justify the optimistic outlook."

△ △ △

**I** CANNOT HELP ADMITTING that I have been a Bergner-fan for the past twenty years. And I venture to say that La Bergner is the greatest actress of Jewish origin since the retirement of Alla Nazimova from the stage. A year ago, when Miss Elizabeth Bergner appeared at New York's Barrymore Theater, in the title role of John Webster's 16th century horror play, *The Duchess of Malfi*, the critics unequivocally hailed her incandescence and her spontaneity, coupled with a rare dignity. Recently she appeared at the Music Box Theatre in a play by Louis Paul, whose title, *The Cup of Trembling*, stems from Isaiah: "Behold I have taken out of thy hands the cup of trembling; thou shalt drink of it no more."

Staged by her husband, Paul Czimmer, *The Cup of Trembling* is the stirring story of a dypsomaniac newspaper woman who is gradually relieved of her alcoholism by psychiatrists and fellow-sufferers. One of New York's leading newspapers hails Vienna-born Miss Bergner as a "remarkable actress with a taste for detail that amounts to obsession." The critic goes on to say: "She can analyze a character scientifically; she can express it in acting meticulously documented with gestures, movements, glances, and vocal inflections. . . ."

# WASHINGTON NOTES

By MURRAY FRANK

Is AMERICA's greatest living historian, Dr. Charles A. Beard, turning reactionary and anti-Semitic? It seems rather astonishingly unbelievable, but the evidence is piling up to substantiate that such is the current trend of his thinking. How else can one explain the fact that, of all things plaguing the world of today, he suddenly decided to embark on a crusade to white-wash the group of alleged seditionists who were tried by the U. S. Government in the famous "mass sedition" case of 1944?

Dr. Beard has long been known as an isolationist and a bitter enemy of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his New Deal. He is the author of *Roosevelt and the Coming of war, 1941*, a supposedly historical expose of Roosevelt's role in bringing the U. S. into World War II, which is not only far from being a credit to Dr. Beard but renders questionable all of his historical writings of recent years. But that is a matter to be determined in the future.

His most current step on the road to Fascism is a letter which he wrote to the so-called "Justice For New Deal Victims Committee," headed by Prescott Dennett and Ellis O. Jones, both of whom are known for their Fascist and anti-Semitic writings and utterances and both of whom were among the 30 alleged seditionists in the mass sedition trial. The purpose of their committee, of course, is to clear their names and the names of their colleagues.

How is this to be accomplished? Simply by convincing the Republicans that as soon as they win the elections and take over the government they will begin a

"thorough investigation of the infamous Roosevelt-Wallace-Truman Mass Sedition Case a la Moscow, generally recognized as a New Deal plan to purge its opponents, undermine our Constitution, and destroy our Republican form of government."

In a statement released by this group reference is made to a letter addressed to them by Dr. Beard in which he is quoted as follows: "I regard the so-called 'mass sedition trial' the saddest travesty on justice in the history of such persecutions since the enactment of the Sedition Act in 1798." Dr. Beard also states that he is now engaged in further historical examination of Roosevelt's war policy and hinted that in his next work he will deal with the Sedition Trial.

The "New Deal victims" are concentrating their efforts entirely in Republican ranks. In view of the approaching elections, it would be most fitting for Republican leadership to repudiate this ultra-reactionary and anti-Semitic group, including their godfather, Dr. Beard. Failure to do so would be interpreted as tacit approval of their crackpot philosophy and antics.

In the meantime, we ask: Is Dr. Beard, until recently America's greatest living historian, turning to extreme nationalism and anti-Semitism?

\* \* \* \*

As THESE lines are written, the special session of Congress began its deliberations and it is not clear at the moment whether the civil rights program, or any single phase of that program, will be taken up

at this session. Readers of these Notes will recall the observation made in our summer edition, written many weeks before Congress adjourned, in which we stated: "President Truman's civil rights program is bogging down more each day with little chance of any part of it being adopted by the present Congress."

When Congress adjourned on the morning of June 20, its record on civil rights legislation was almost a total failure. Save for an anti-poll tax clause in the new draft law and one or two other minor bills affecting a handful of individuals, the civil rights program remained intact and unlegislated. Major civil rights features, such as anti-lynching, anti-poll tax, anti-segregation, fair employment practice and others, were lost in the final rush to adjourn and never reached the floor for a vote.

The excuse that lack of time before the adjournment or the fear of a Southern filibuster made it impossible to consider such matters is rather flimsy and groundless. The 80th Congress has been in session since January 1947. Had there been an earnest desire to consider the problem of civil rights on the part of our legislators, they had sufficient time for it and need not have waited to the very last. The FEPC bill was introduced in Congress as early as March 1947. The anti-lynching bill was introduced in May of the same year. Neither of these two bills ever reached the floor of the Senate or House for a vote. The anti-poll tax bill fared somewhat better. It was introduced early in January 1947, it was passed in the House by a substantial majority of 290 to 112, it was reported favorably by the Senate Rules Committee, but was never called up for a final vote on the Senate floor. Other bills dealing with segregation, discrimination, and violations of civil rights never even reached a point where they were considered at committee hearings.

Such was the record of the 80th Congress on civil rights legislation, a record

of dismal failure in protecting the rights of minorities who are thus relegated to the position of second-class citizens. Notwithstanding the significant report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, President Truman's civil rights program of last February, the President's repeated demands for civil rights legislation in Congress, and the promises of such action on the part of Republican leadership in Congress, nothing was accomplished. In view of such performance, is it any wonder that one remains skeptical about the outlook for civil rights legislation at the current special session? We shall be pleasantly surprised if one or more of these bills is seriously considered and passed by Congress.

\* \* \* \*

ONE OF THE most vicious pieces of legislation passed by Congress before its adjournment in June is the highly discriminatory Revercomb-Wiley Displaced Persons bill to admit 205,000 DPs to the United States over a period of two years. Despite the fact that a substantial number of DPs are to be admitted to this country, the new act is actually a move in the direction of shutting off immigration completely and as such it is the most dangerous anti-immigration act for nearly a quarter of a century since the quota system was instituted in 1924.

The anti-immigration elements in Congress, headed by Sen. Chapman Revercomb (Republican of West Virginia), is currently holding hearings in Washington on the whole immigration set-up with the aim to abolish the quota system and replace it with a discriminatory system of selective immigration. The committee conducting hearings is scheduled to make its report to Congress by March 1, 1949, which means that that will be the beginning of a concentrated drive for a more rigid immigration policy.

Meanwhile, the new DP act contains the following major points of discrimination aimed against Jews and Catholics,

and showing a decided preference for certain European nationals:

1. Only those who were in the DP camps prior to December 22, 1945, will be recognized as DPs and will be eligible to apply for admission. The State Department and the U. S. military authorities in Europe suggested April 21, 1947, as the eligibility date, but were ignored by Congress. This is a distinct discrimination against Jews since less than 10,000 Jews were inmates of the camps by the end of 1945, whereas most of the present Jewish DPs reached the camps in 1946 after escaping from Eastern Europe.

2. At least 40 percent of the DPs to be admitted must be of Baltic origin. Oddly enough, these people are all Protestants, so that this provision constitutes discrimination against Jews and Catholics. Why these Balts should get this preferential status is questionable for two reasons: they constitute only 20 percent of the DP population, and they were among the closest collaborators of the Nazis during the war and in many instances played an important role in the extermination of European Jewry.

3. At least 30 percent of those to be admitted must be farmers, which again excludes Jews almost entirely.

4. Those admitted will be charged against future quotas up to 50 percent for each year, which means that since the 205,000 DPs will be admitted within the quota system, the U. S. is actually not at all generous. It is merely taking away 200,000 visas from people who have been waiting for many years to enter this country as regular immigrants and is giving these visas to that many DPs. This is not only hypocritical, but is discrimination against nationals of nearly every European country who would otherwise be eligible to enter the U. S.

5. Perhaps the most shameful adaptation of Nazi racist theories contained in the bill is the point applying to the so-called "Volksdeutsche," namely, persons

of German ethnic origin who were born in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and other countries and who now reside in Germany. The Volksdeutsche, who were the Hitler vanguard in Central and Eastern Europe, will be recognized as Germans and admitted under the German quota up to 50 percent of that quota. Thus, for the period of two years some 27,000 Volksdeutsche will be admitted to the U. S., whereas the Jewish DPs to be admitted under this discriminatory bill will probably number much less than half that figure.

These are the major, though not the only, points of discrimination contained in the bill. Other restrictive clauses set up housing and employment requirements, careful screening as to political ideology, etc. It should be understood, that this bill is not an accident, not something dreamed up overnight, but carefully and deliberately planned by anti-immigration elements for the past several years. Sen. Revercomb is reported to have told his colleagues on the immigration committee when they first undertook the task of preparing legislation to solve the DP problem:

"We could solve this DP problem all right if we could work out some bill that would keep out the Jews."

The result, as we know it today, is one of the worst and most shameful pieces of racist legislation which is a betrayal of American principles of democracy and America's traditional principles of aid to the oppressed and the persecuted. Efforts will be made in the special session of Congress to liberalize the act and throw out some of these obnoxious restrictions, but the chances for success of such efforts are not too bright.

\* \* \* \*

DURING THE prolonged debates in Congress on the new Selective Service Act which went into effect recently, there were many efforts to eliminate segregation and discrimination in the armed



forces on account of race, color, or religious affiliation. Every one of these efforts was defeated by a combination of Southern reactionary Democrats and Northern and Western reactionary Republicans.

During the discussions on the draft bill, liberal-minded Mrs. Helen Gahagan Douglas, California Democrat, rose to defend one of the liberalizing amendments and thereby made this interesting observation:

"I think there is nothing more important today than that the minority groups in our country feel that they are an integral part of the community and the Nation. If they are made to feel that there are walls between them and the majority in the community, they may become receptive to those influences which tend to divide a nation."

This is a forthright and excellent warning which should be brought to the attention of the powers-that-be in the political, economic and social aspects of American life and civilization. Disregard of the contributions of minority groups, failure to acknowledge their rights and equal status as American citizens, and failure to grant them equal opportunity to participate in the life of the Nation and the community will most surely lead to the erection of barriers and to the division of the nation. This may at some future crucial moment prove to be a fatal weakness.

\* \* \* \*

ANOTHER outstanding American woman who raised her voice against discrimination against minority groups in this country is Dr. Sarah Blanding, president of Vassar College. In an address recently at a conference of state presidents of the American Association of University Women, held in Washington, Dr. Blanding discussed "Group Tensions in the American Community." Here are some of her most important observations on the subject:

"We are facing a third world war because of insufficient progress in the

elimination of racial and group tensions. Group tensions, however, are not peculiar to this country but can be found around the world." (She attributed these tensions to clefts and cleavages stemming from people of different origins and economic inequalities, then continued her discourse:) "Segregation of races constitutes a real danger both here and abroad. The whole world is watching us. As they see us practicing discriminations they wonder what we mean by democracy. They see us treating Chinese and Japanese in ways in which no American would be treated in their countries. The future of this Nation and the rest of the world depends upon how well we can demonstrate that our moral and social democratic attitudes are impregnable."

In conclusion, Dr. Blanding enumerated among those minority groups which are being discriminated against in this country the following: 13 million Negroes; 5 million Jews; 2 million Mexicans; 370,000 Indians; about 300,000 Orientals; plus an unknown number of Slavic origin. Thus, the total is at least between 21 and 25 million people, possibly more, constituting roughly about one-sixth of our population. Not included here are some 20 or 25 million Catholics in the U. S. who experience a certain degree of discrimination. These figures merely emphasize the seriousness of the warning contained in the remarks and observations by Dr. Blanding and Mrs. Douglas. Will they arouse the proper response or will they prove to be voices crying in the wilderness?

\* \* \* \*

YOU MAY have heard this, but it is a story worth retelling. A Negro union leader, Richard W. Smith, secretary of the Joint Council of Dining Car Employees, wrote a letter to a Congressman in which he complained that during a recent trip to Washington in connection with his union activities he was "in a desert in the center of our Nation's Capital" because

no drinking water was available and none would be sold to him because he is a Negro.

In his letter, Smith proceeds to outline several measures to safeguard the civil liberties of minorities and then adds: "Regardless of the outcome of the struggle for the greater items I have mentioned, would you kindly cooperate in getting me a drink—just a drink of water." And who is the Congressman to whom this peculiar request was addressed? John Rankin of Mississippi, arch-foe of the Negro minority in the House of Representatives! Was Smith that naive to believe that Rankin would want to help in so simple a matter as getting a drink of water for a Negro? Not at all. By addressing it to Rankin he showed to the world, through the medium of the press, to what absurdities discrimination and segregation will lead.

One wonders whether this is a commentary on our civilization or a postscript?

\* \* \* \*

**T**HE REMOVAL of Loy Henderson, arch enemy of Zionism and of the state of Israel, from his influential position as director of the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs to the post of Ambassador to India, is definitely a demotion. Despite the assurance by Secretary Marshall that the transfer had no connection with the criticism against Henderson emanating from Jewish circles, it is a known fact that the violently anti-Zionist and pro-Arab stand of the Henderson group in the State Department had embarrassed the Administration on several notable occasions during the past two years.

Henderson's removal from the Washington scene came as the result of a personal suggestion—a gentle but nevertheless firm request—from President Truman that he be given a foreign post, the further away from Washington the

better. The President is said to have become thoroughly disgusted with the State Department's Near Eastern "expert" whose blundering advice on Palestine was chiefly responsible for the wavering U. S. policy concerning the Holy Land.

Henderson, a career diplomat for the past quarter of a century, served as Minister to Iraq during the recent war years. There he came under the influence of Arab effendis and officials of the British Foreign Office from whom he acquired the philosophy of 19th century imperialism and the view of the native population as inferior fourth-rate human beings who should be kept in a state of perpetual backwardness.

It is unfortunate that with this type of an approach and mentality regarding Palestine and the Near East, Henderson was charged with directing American policy in a period when efforts were made to obtain a peaceful solution of the Palestine problem during the last three crucial years. It is no exaggeration to state that much of the recent bloodshed in Palestine was due directly to the biased, stubborn, and nearsighted views of Loy Henderson.

Now that he is entirely out of the Washington picture and almost entirely out of the Near East picture, observers here foresee a more positive and more stable U. S. attitude toward Israel and more cordial relations between the American people and the people of Israel in the future. The Palestine problem still maintains a major place on the international agenda, but the prospects for a speedy solution are much brighter today in view of the expected and unwavering pro-Israel policy on the part of the United States. The removal of Loy Henderson has helped to lift the fog in Washington. Though somewhat belated, it is a step in the right direction—a step in the direction of world peace.

# West Coast Letter

By CAREY McWILLIAMS

GUY ENDORE, the novelist, who wrote a stirring pamphlet about the Sleepy Lagoon case in Los Angeles some years ago, has recently turned his pamphlet-eering talents to a new case involving Mexicans and the police. The current pamphlet is entitled "Justice For Salcido," and relates the tragic story of what happened to Augustin Salcido, a 17-year-old Mexican-American, during the early morning hours of Wednesday, March 10, 1948.

Around midnight on this date two Los Angeles police officers in plainclothes walked into El Coconito cafe in the Bunker Hill area of Los Angeles—a run-down, overcrowded, poverty-stricken district, largely inhabited by Mexican-Mexicans, which borders on the civic center. This was not the district in which either officer regularly worked nor had they been given a specific assignment in the area. Later, however, they testified that they had received a tip regarding fifty stolen watches and that it was this tip which had brought them to the dimly-lighted El Coconito with its blaring jukeboxes. One of the officers, William J. Keyes, sat down in a booth; the other, Sanchez, walked up to the bar and there engaged Salcido in conversation.

A few moments later, Officer Sanchez

and Salcido walked out of the cafe and Keyes followed them up Temple Street to the entrance of the building which is occupied by the offices of the Jewish Welfare Federation. At this hour of the night, of course, the building was closed; there was not a soul about the premises; and the doors were locked. It is important to note that in going from the El Coconito to the entrance of this building, Sanchez had taken Salcido in a direction opposite from that in which the officers' car was parked. The entrance to the Jewish Federation building is somewhat cave-like: a narrow, blind, upward-sloping dead-end. Keyes testified that when he got to the entrance he heard Officer Sanchez call for him and saw Salcido start "to break away" and run. There was, of course, no way by which Salcido could escape from Sanchez except by coming down the stairs toward Keyes.

At this time, Keyes, with drawn gun, stopped Salcido and motioned him up the stairs toward Sanchez who was still standing in the dark, unlighted entrance-way. According to Keyes, Salcido turned and started, once again, to run away; but he didn't get far. As the boy reached the street, he was shot five times by Officer Keyes. One of the shots must have been fired at close range for it left powder-

burns and the experts say that powder tattooing never occurs if the bullet has to travel more than sixteen inches. Salcido lost consciousness immediately and was dead by the time the ambulance arrived.

The first question that comes to mind in pondering these facts—all related by the officers—is this: just what was in the minds of these two officers when Salcido was taken to the deep, cave-like entrance-way of the deserted building. Neither of the officers contended that Salcido had been placed under arrest at the time the shooting occurred; nor had he committed a crime in their presence; nor had they a warrant for his arrest. Had it been their intention to arrest him, it would seem that they would have taken him directly to their parked police car, but the car was in the opposite direction. "Surely," writes Mr. Endore, "these men had something in mind, for Sanchez was so determined that the boy must stay in the alcove that he grabbed hold of him, and Keyes was even more determined, for he drew his gun. I would say that they were going to beat him up." And I would say that Mr. Endore's conclusion is correct.

The other question which the facts immediately prompt is this: why did Keyes pump five bullets into Salcido at close range? There was no way by which Salcido could have escaped from the one-way entrance except by coming down the stairs and Keyes, a big, burly police officer, was standing on the stairs. Yet, according to Keyes, he made no effort to stop the boy, such as by grabbing him, or simply blocking the exit. The facts of the case follow too closely the pattern of the Sleepy Lagoon case of 1942, and the killing by a police officer of 13-year-old Eugene Montenegro two years later, to be dismissed as simply "unfortunate" or as "one of those things." For the Salcido case happens to be "one of those things" which have been recurring in Los Angeles for many years as part of the running

feud between Mexican-Americans and the police.

The great public interest which the case has aroused has been prompted, not so much by sympathy for Salcido—who had a police record—as by indignation over the conduct of the two officers and by the all-too-familiar way in which their brother officers and superiors have attempted to protect them and to sabotage a real investigation. It was, of course, a foregone conclusion that the Coroner's Jury would exonerate the officers; "justifiable homicide" was the familiar verdict. It was also a foregone conclusion that the District Attorney would, as he did, refuse to see a committee of citizens that called to demand a full investigation. But it was surprising, even in Los Angeles, to see the way in which the police, after an honest magistrate had been induced to issue a warrant for the arrest of Keyes, attempted to intimidate the witnesses. One witness, William Gallegos, who lived in the neighborhood and who knew Salcido, arrived on the scene in time to see the last shot fired. Once the warrant had been issued for Keyes, police officers called to see Gallegos and "took him in" for questioning. Thereafter they followed him, night and day, and stopped him on several occasions for searching and questioning. Then, one day, two police officers came up behind Gallegos on the street, one on either side, and this time when they searched him they found—so they claimed—marijuana cigarettes in his possession. Unfortunately for the police officers, a jury failed to convict Gallegos, although his defense consisted simply in his word against that of the officers.

The Keyes case, after many delays, will be tried shortly and a large section of the public will pay close attention to the conduct of the trial. In all essential particulars, the Salcido case is simply another illustration, the latest episode, of the way in which the Los Angeles police periodically "crack down" on the Mexican-American minority. Copies of Guy



Endore's pamphlet, for which I have written an introduction, can be obtained from the Civil Rights Congress, 307 S. Hill Street, Los Angeles.

\* \* \* \*

ON A RECENT VISIT to El Paso, I had occasion to observe one of the most interesting, and curious, Jewish communities in the Southwest. There are approximately 2,000 Jewish residents of El Paso, by comparison with 4,000 Negroes and a large Spanish-speaking element. No one knows precisely how many Spanish-speaking people reside in El Paso but they are believed to constitute more than 60% of the total population. Here is a situation, in other words, in which three "minority" groups could, if they worked together, hold a decisive power in all local civic affairs. Despite the obvious potential power of the three groups, however, the Anglo-Americans run the community as they see fit. With the exception of one Spanish-speaking resident who was recently elected to the school board, there are no Jewish, Negro, or Mexican-American officials.

For the most part, the Jewish community is made up of old-established, pioneer families, many of whom have prospered over the years and have come to feel a largely fictitious security because of the absence of the more obvious forms of discrimination. Occupying a social position between the Anglos, on the one hand, and the Hispanos, on the other, they have been reluctant to disturb the status quo and have neglected to establish a real understanding and accord with the Spanish-speaking element. While there is little social discrimination, it is nevertheless apparent that the Jews are not really integrated with the rest of the community and that it would not take much, in the way of friction, to jar the fault-line which separates Jews from non-Jews in El Paso. In the person of Rabbi Wendell Phillips, the Jews of El Paso have an outstanding

liberal leader but one whose leadership is tolerated rather than respected or followed. On a number of important issues, the Jewish community has failed to back-up Rabbi Phillips.

The social situation in El Paso is not unlike that which is to be found in other Texas cities. Some of the leading Jewish families in El Paso arrived in the 'eighties and 'nineties and therefore enjoy the status of "first families," for El Paso is but one remove from its frontier phase. Apparently there was a time, in the history of the community, when only the slightest and most nebulous sense of difference prevailed between Jew and non-Jew. During this period the Jews took a more active interest in community affairs and were occasionally elected or appointed to public office. Everyone seemed to be aware of this halcyon period in the past and of some invisible but nevertheless vaguely-sensed point in time at which the old intimacy between the two groups had been superseded by the less intimate, more formal, relationship which currently prevails. One shrewd observer told me that she thought this "chill" had occurred around 1920. Rabbi Phillips fixes a somewhat later date, around 1927, when the Junior League was first organized in El Paso.

Perhaps the best way to characterize relations between Jews and non-Jews in El Paso today would be to say that they are "unreal:" superficially cordial, marked by an absence of overt friction, but yet vaguely unsatisfactory, tinged with a sense of frustration. The atmosphere is so unreal, in this sense, that one prosperous Jewish merchant told me that he had sent his children east to school so that they might learn about anti-Semitism; he was distressed by the feeling that, if they went to school in El Paso, they would reach maturity without ever having known just what it means to be a Jew. There is a calm about Jewish-Gentile relations in El Paso, but there is little ease, little real acceptance.

What the Jews of El Paso do not seem to realize is that the present unstable equilibrium has been purchased at the price of not challenging the Anglo-American dominance in civic affairs and, particularly, in not challenging this dominance at its most vulnerable point, namely, in its roughshod suppression of the Spanish-speaking "majority." If Jews were ever to collaborate with this Spanish-speaking majority or to assist it in the direction of self-organization or to provide it with leadership, one can safely predict that the social climate of opinion in El Paso would change overnight. One reason why this particular Jewish community is so lacking in the kind of liberal leadership usually found in Jewish communities is that it is overwhelmingly middle class and thus tends to identify itself with the Anglo-American ruling cliques. But one can also predict that, once the college-educated sons and daughters of El Paso Jewry begin to enter civic life, a new chapter will be written. For one can sense in these younger people a certain restlessness, an eagerness to test out the invisible barriers which prevail. In the meantime, however, Rabbi Phillips, who must bridge this transition, is probably one of the most frustrated and unhappy liberals in the Southwest.

\* \* \* \*

GERALD L. K. SMITH's Christian Nationalist Crusade has just issued a translation of Martin Luther's infamous document, "The Jews and Their Lies." Enclosed in copies of the pamphlet distributed on the west coast is a leaflet announcing that the Christian Nationalist Crusade is also publishing the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. A foreword announces that the same publishers will shortly issue a pamphlet made up of the edicts of more than 20 Popes "who dealt with the Jewish Problem."

It should not be forgotten that the Nazis made use of Martin Luther's writ-

ings on "the Jewish Problem," slanting these materials at the Protestant sects, notably the Lutherans. For example, "J. Wolfgarden" of Hanover, Germany—a phoney name used by the Nazi propaganda office—mailed out many copies of this particular Luther pamphlet prior to 1939. An English translation was issued, also, in the 'thirties by George Sylvester Viereck. In September, 1939, the American Freedom Association, a thinly-veiled anti-Semitic organization in Los Angeles, printed material from Luther's pamphlet in its magazine, *American Freedom*. At the same time, the German House in Los Angeles, headquarters of the Bundists, sold copies of the Luther pamphlet in a bookstore maintained on the property. Likewise, David Baxter, of San Bernardino, California—one of the defendants in the sedition case—printed and distributed copies of the same document in the pre-war period. The Independent Voters of America, another anti-Semitic "front" organization which once maintained office space in the Oviatt Building in Los Angeles (provided free of cost), also issued mimeographed copies of excerpts from the pamphlet. During the war an anonymous organization sent copies of Representative Jeanette Rankin's speech against the declaration of war, together with mimeographed excerpts from the Luther document, to sailors who had been discharged from the Navy. This background indicates, all too clearly, that Smith, in publishing the entire pamphlet, is simply picking up where his colleagues, the Nazis, left off.

The background of Luther's writings about the Jews is well-known; it is dealt with, among other sources, in Josef Kas-tein's book, *History and Destiny of the Jews*, 1933, pp. 329-330. In 1523 Luther published a pamphlet, "That Jesus Christ Was Born A Jew," in which he reminded his followers that the Jews were their kinsmen, cousins, and brothers of the Saviour. "If we wish to help them," he wrote, "we must act towards them accord-

ing to the law of Christians and not of papal love." The utterance of such words caused many people to hope that the Reformation was destined to bring about a return to Christianity as a religion of love and not of hate. But it soon became apparent that Luther's idea of "helping" the Jews was precisely the same as that of the Catholic Church, namely, baptism. It was only after his missionary endeavors had failed that he published a number of anti-Semitic tracts: "Letter Against the Sabbatarians," "Concerning the Jews and Their Lies," and "Concerning the Shem Ha-Mephorash," in which he repeated and proceeded to embroider the old lies and calumnies. The tone of these documents, writes Kastein, was "so coarse that the Swiss reformer Bullinger declared that they must have been written by a swineherd instead of by a famous shepherd of souls." It was Luther's about-face on the Jewish issue which so largely robbed the Reformation of its early promise of better days. Like the Nazis, it is apparent that Smith intends to use this pamphlet as a means of appealing to the latent anti-Semitism to be found in certain Protestant sects and that he will

later make a similar appeal to certain sections of Catholic opinion by re-issuing the more infamous papal edicts on "the Jewish Problem." An alert Protestant (particularly Lutheran) and Catholic leadership should promptly condemn this crass appeal to prejudice and should, in no uncertain terms, repudiate these coarse and swinish words of Martin Luther.

\* \* \* \*

THE COMMISSION ON Law and Social Action of the American Jewish Congress in Los Angeles continues its effective work against discrimination. Recently the commission discovered that the "police tags" issued by the Santa Monica police for traffic violations contain a question as to the "descent" of the violator and that the police have been in the habit of filling in "Jewish" when handing out tickets to Jews. Just why this information should be deemed necessary in traffic violations is a matter concerning which the Santa Monica police have maintained a dense silence; but the Congress intends to get an answer and, also, to get the question eliminated.

# BOOKS

*The Future of the American Jew*, by Mordecai M. Kaplan. The Macmillan Company. New York, 1948, 571 pp. \$6.00.

Reading this volume, one is again struck by the fact that Dr. Kaplan occupies a position of real pre-eminence among modern Jewish thinkers. Certainly his formulations are the result of long study and careful thought. It is incumbent, therefore, upon the seriously-minded American Jew to devote attention to the Reconstructionist movement.

The ideals of pre-emancipation Jewry are forever dead. The Jews in America live in a democratic society—the first time in Jewish history that an adjustment has had to be made to exactly this type of social order. Should the Jew wish to continue with the ideology based on the Ghetto, he will further alienate his children. To continue with the ideology of the Ghetto will also force a critical reaction on the part of the majority group who cannot but be alienated by a Jewish ideology so out of harmony with modern American civilization.

This, then, is the problem with which Dr. Kaplan confronts himself. In *The Future of the American Jew* he restates the answers which he has already given in his famous volume *Judaism as a Civilization*, modifies a number of previous pronouncements, and gives us some new material on a variety of subjects related to his main theme.

Dr. Kaplan's answer is: Revamp Jewish life and thought so that it will be able to meet the challenge of 20th century existence. Keep the theme of religion but do not conserve to the point of diminishing returns. With one hand seize the scalpel to cut away dead matter; with the other grasp the trowel to spread the mortar which will add new bricks to the structure of Judaism. Build a new Jewish

civilization where each individual will find satisfaction such as to make him a well-adjusted human being. The Jew will live in American civilization and at the same time inhabit a Jewish community whose institutions and ideals are in harmony with those held by the majority group. Living in two civilizations at the same time will be an arduous task. However, Jews who love their Judaism will make the attempt.

By now, most of Dr. Kaplan's techniques for the reviving of Judaism are fairly well known. They have in a sense seeped down to some fairly sizeable segments of the Jewish community. The individuals comprising these groups are exposed to rabbis and Jewish leaders who are to a greater or lesser extent Reconstructionists. The importance of Palestine for the revival of our community (particularly the spiritual values to be derived from the Zionist movement) is a point frequently stressed. By replacing present chaos with an organized democratic structure, some of the difficulties of American Jewish life will be obviated. Jewish theology must be brought in line with modern thinking. Such outmoded concepts as the chosen people idea must be discarded. Judaism should be supplemented by a new art, a new music, a new literature—all of it Jewish and all of it affording the Jews a means of aesthetic self-expression.

Since Dr. Kaplan treats religious observances as folkways designed to insure the enhancement of the value of Jewish life, he is a comparatively free agent to write out the type of prescription for a ritual code of American Jewry which he thinks best. But he would prefer to accomplish this in the following manner:

To reinstate Jewish law, it is necessary to re-establish Jewish society. . . . In Eretz Yisroel, the great need is for a code of civil law to



govern all human relationships. In the Diaspora, Jewry must organize voluntary constitutional communities that would regulate Jewish interests, and formulate such laws as would be binding on all Jews. Though ritual regulations cannot be included as part of Jewish constitutional law, they need not be left to individual caprice. Ritual regulations would be observed by members of voluntary organizations that would undertake to abide by them. By such democratic processes, Jewish law could again be made to function in Jewish life.

It is well that readers of this restatement of Reconstructionism think through some of the assumptions of the philosophy. Since many Jews of the survivalist type accept many of Dr. Kaplan's solutions, the time may be ripe for a re-examination of the problem. We are assuming, of course, that this re-examination is based upon the major premise of the movement: that Jewish survival in the present world is possible and desirable.

Although this volume is rather jumpy (it is in essence a collection of separate essays) most readers will be bothered by the rather doctrinaire tone which is used throughout. Since the author relies on the method of general observation rather than upon the utilization of scientific materials or the experimental method in framing both his diagnosis as well as his recommendations, it would have been well to proceed in a more cautious and exploratory tone.

Be that as it may, we should clearly understand that Reconstructionism is based upon the assumption that the Jews of this country will continue to live in a land permeated by the liberal spirit. Class antagonisms, racial disturbances, and the encroachment both of the right and the left must be kept to a minimum. Any force which will upset the applecart and draw new lines in American society must be resisted. From one point of view, therefore, a movement which formulates Jewish survival on the presumption of a continuing liberalism may be a liability rather than an asset. Consider the formulation of *liberal* Czechoslovak leaders, who, foreseeing the "Ice Age" stated some time ago that they wished to liquidate the eternal problem of the minority. Would the Jew, therefore, prefer to go to Palestine or does he wish to assimilate into the body politic?

Another of Dr. Kaplan's presumptions is that Judaism can be modified so that it may be brought in harmony with the

ideology of the majority. Of course, one may modify Jewish doctrine and bring it up to date as did one of Dr. Kaplan's disciples, Rabbi Milton Steinberg, in his recent book, *Basic Judaism*. Will the resultant product, admittedly a hyphenated Judaism (as all Judaism in the modern world *must* be) have enough stamina to resist the inevitable competition in the market place? Let us grant for the moment that liberal civilization in America will continue. Can Reconstructionist Judaism compete? This is the question which emerges for this reviewer as a result of reading Dr. Kaplan's book.

MARSHALL SKLARE

---

*The Age of the Great Depression, 1929-1941*, by Dixon Wecter. New York: The Macmillan Co. 362 pp. \$5.00.

Professor Wecter's account of the Age of the Great depression is factual and objective. He has no thesis to establish, no case to make. Nevertheless those, and they are many, who now speak contemptuously of the New Deal would do well to review the Hoover and Roosevelt era and remind themselves just what was accomplished to put our country on its feet and against what conservative opposition. The mistakes made in the haste of extemporary expediency are evident enough. But more memorable are the solid accomplishments and the education of a nation to a new way of looking at their government and the place it occupies in their general well-being. The New Deal greatly weakened the traditional economic philosophy of rugged individualism. It did much to socialize the American mind.

We are now entering a period of reaction but it is safe to predict that many of the reforms achieved in the Roosevelt era will become a permanent part of the American economy and philosophy. There will be other projects similar to that of the Tennessee Valley. Banking and investment practices will remain under federal control. Old age pensions and unemployment insurance will grow rather than diminish. Conservation control under federal direction will not be relaxed. The ideal of a planned economy will more and more be attractive to the common mind and with it the elimination of waste and gross profiteering. These and many other ideas and practices were proposed to the American mind and found wide

acceptance. The force of circumstances has made us proceed on the path, not towards theoretical socialism, but towards some practical compromise between a laissez-faire economy and state socialism. We have learned that there are many things which only the central government can effectively do for the benefit of the nation as a whole. Our system of individual enterprise itself, in which we take such clamorous pride, can only function as it is regulated by the state and the evils inherent in it mitigated by law and federal boards of control.

The literature on the years of Professor Wecter's study is already immense. His bibliography, which, too, is vast, indicates the best studies existent upon the multiple phases of the period. Altogether this is an admirable brief survey, reminding us of what we have too readily forgotten and pointing out the significance of the conflicts of practices and social philosophies which have confused us. Young voters, whose memories of the Great Depression are the confused remembrances of childhood and youth, can profitably learn from a reading of Professor Wecter's book things needful to them in devising their social philosophies and declaring their political affiliations.

CARL GRABO

*The Origins of the Russian-Jewish Labour Movement*, by A. L. Patkin. Bloch Publishing Co. 277 pp. \$3.50.

Although much has been written in Yiddish and other languages on the history of the Jewish labor movement in Czarist Russia, this is the first time that a significant historical work on this subject has appeared in English. The author, A. L. Patkin, is himself a Russian Jew who took an active part in the revolutionary movement of pre-Communist Russia. His journalistic and propaganda activities among Jewish workers and Russian factory workers led to several arrests and a year in jail in a Russian prison. During the Kerensky Government in 1917, which preceded the Bolshevik Revolution, he served on the Moscow City Council and was vice-president of the Jewish People's Party (Volkspartei). He opposed the Communist regime and subsequently succeeded in escaping from his native country. In 1927, he took up residence in Melbourne, Australia, where

he now resides engaged in journalistic activities.

Patkin traces the origins of the Jewish labor movement in Russia from the early 19th century and discusses its growth and development, its political accomplishments and its cultural influences to the early decades of the present century. Thus, he interprets one of the most dynamic chapters in modern Jewish history; he shows the influence of the classical Russian literature and philosophy on the Jewish masses and the development of a Russian-Jewish Intelligentsia which gave birth to new sources of creative energy in the modern Yiddish and Hebrew literatures and the philosophical restatement of Jewish religious values and national concepts.

The author describes very ably the political and social background of the Jewish labor movement in Czarist Russia, its political and cultural philosophies, its relationship to various phases of Russian and Jewish life, and its leading figures. He touches upon major cultural and spiritual life in Russia, such as Chassidism, the Haskalah movement, the beginnings of Jewish emancipation, the relationship between Jewish tradition and the class struggle, the Hebrew and Yiddish literature of the period, the Jewish national problem, the tremendous influence of the late great Jewish historian Simon Dubnov, the struggle between Yiddishism and Hebraism, etc.

Much space is devoted to the major Jewish political parties which developed within the ranks of the Jewish laboring masses of Russia, particularly the Bund, the Zionist-Socialist Party, and the Jewish Socialist Workers' Party (known as Seimists) which based its solution of the Jewish problem on territorialism. He shows how the uprising of the Jewish masses under the banners of one form of Socialism or another fitted in at first quite well into the Russian pattern. The poor Jewish masses were vastly influenced by the lofty idealism and humanitarianism of the Russian classical literature, by the belief of the Russian Intelligentsia in a sense of justice for the common man, and by the orientation of the entire revolutionary movement on the interests and aspirations of the toiling masses.

The Jewish masses were the poorest of the poor and responded readily to the call to organize themselves and fight for im-

proved conditions of work and life. But once their minds had been awakened to their economic shortcomings and their lack of human dignity, the Jewish masses began to take greater pride in their Jewish way of life and in their national cultural values; they developed an intimate attachment to Yiddish, which became for them an instrument of cultural enlightenment and a medium of self expression.

In the latter part of the 19th century, the Russian-Jewish Intelligentsia began to realize that Socialism in itself, as preached by Plechanov and other Russian Marxist theoreticians, was far from satisfactory because it disregarded specific Jewish problems. They particularly felt the lack of Jewish spiritual and moral values as interpreted from the times of the ancient Hebrew prophets. Hence, they began to search for new formulas which would represent an integration of Socialist thought and the Jewish cultural heritage to form a new way of life, if not a new civilization.

Thus came about the birth of a purely Jewish Socialist school of thought which split into several factions, based on historical experience and their differing approach to the amelioration of existing national problems. This new orientation brought on a revival of modern Jewish literature in both Yiddish and Hebrew, and the emergence of Labor Zionism as a movement for national liberation of the Jewish people and the rational solution to the Jewish problem. The strength and future of Jewish Socialism, the author feels, is dependent on the national and cultural regeneration of the Jewish people.

The book, which is primarily an historical work, should prove to be an excellent source of information for American Jewish youth on one of the most interesting and most creative periods of modern Jewish history. It was a period replete with new ideas and ideals whose effect is still felt wherever Jews live. The author ably revives that period in all its glory.

MURRAY FRANK

*Americans From Hungary*, by Emil Lengyel. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 319 pp. \$4.00.

At the end of World War I Harvard's Schlessinger pointed out in his *New Viewpoints in American History* that America's

historical ideology would have to be brought into a more proper focus by re-evaluating more definitely the role played in its historical development by the non-Anglo-Saxon people. Adamic has popularized this thesis and has also received more credit for the originality of this conception than Schlessinger and others. At any rate, "The Peoples of America Series," edited by Adamic will be a great contribution to our history if the high standard established by Lengyel's magnificent contribution is maintained. Well-known to us from his other numerous books, Lengyel has again produced a volume of great and substantial merits, in fact, it has the distinction of being the best survey of Hungary's history as related to the growth of this republic in terms of the individual and collective immigration from Hungary. Not that we can agree with everything that Lengyel has done here. For instance, his bibliography is not complete, and it might have been well to point out that several outstanding Hungarians (such as Kon-schak, or Count Benyowsky) have already been, by good historical evidence, claimed by other than Hungarian immigrants as the "founding fathers" of their settlements in this country. But these are, indeed, very minor weaknesses of a volume which is the most authoritative and penetrating analysis of its subject, as well as a valuable reference encyclopedia on Hungary's social history.

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK

*Occupational Patterns of American Jewry*. By Nathan Goldberg. Jewish Theological Seminary Press. University Press, 85 pp.

Occupational information is playing an ever-increasing role in vocational guidance. One of the most difficult types to obtain, and yet of utmost importance is occupational data on the employment and occupational status of members of minority groups. Much of the material collected to date has been limited in scope and subject to error and lack of objectivity. Mr. Goldberg's latest contribution to the "Jewish Life in America Series" is in many ways, a valuable addition to the literature on occupations.

The author begins his publication with a critical analysis and ends with one. He prefaces his report with a sound debunk-

ing of the notion that "the Jews control or will control America," and concludes with an evaluation of the investigations up-to-date of the occupational structure of American Jews. Mr. Goldberg never deviates too far from the facts and figures and for this reason, his objective survey should provide an excellent source-book for future researchers in this field. In addition, his publication may prove to be an important aid to those engaged in the difficult problem of vocationally counseling Jewish youth.

Taking as his point of departure, the occupational patterns of the immigrant Jews of two generations ago, the author traces the changes which have occurred since then. He follows this with an attempt to assess the socio-economic status and the place of the Jew in the American economic structure. Occupational trends of native-born American Jews are surveyed and an attempt is made to predict the future occupational composition of American Jewry.

Some of the specific problems treated by Mr. Goldberg include:

What fields of work are American Jews tending towards?

How different is the occupational status of Jews today compared with their immigrant grandfathers?

What are the chances of a Jewish applicant who is trying to enter medical school?

For the qualitative as well as the quantitative answers to such questions, the reader can turn to Mr. Goldberg's well-thought-out critical survey of the available literature on the occupational patterns of American Jewry.

BERNARD M. BASS

---

*The French-Canadian Outlook: A Brief Account of the Unknown North Americans*, by Mason Wade. The Viking Press, New York. 192 pp. \$2.00.

The city of Ottawa, P.Q., capital of the Dominion of Canada, is predominantly Anglo-Saxon and Protestant; most of the French people who work there in government buildings, stores, and restaurants reside on the left bank of the Ottawa River, in Hull, P.Q., which, despite its English name, is nearly as French as any city in metropolitan France. A wit once asserted that the best thing between the

British and the French was the Channel; as for Eastern Canada, even a casual visitor cannot fail to notice that what separates the province of Ottawa from that of Quebec is more than just a river, it is a thick wall of suspicion and hostility created, in the course of centuries, around "New France." Regrettably, it is safe to say that this sort of Chinese Wall has been, so far, the only major work done jointly by both ethnic groups.

For a Jew it is particularly interesting to travel through Eastern Canada and to peruse some of the vast literature written about the Anglo-French controversy there. The motto of Quebec is "Je me souviens" (I remember) which could also serve as that of the Jewish people. The French minority has been defending its language as tenaciously as some of our Yiddishists have been trying to save their idiom from disintegration—as stubbornly and, for obvious reasons, far more successfully. The French Canadians are as free as are the Jews in most countries to change their names and their religion, to marry outside the fold and to merge with the majority population; in fact, they should find less difficulty in casting off their identity than the Jews. However, the vast majority of them are as "clannish" as the Jews are said to be, and the actual number of French Canadian "assimilationists" seems to be comparatively much smaller than that of Jewish assimilationists.

Mr. Wade tries to make us, if not love, at least understand the motifs of French-Canadian "isolationism." The province of Quebec where most of the 3½ million French-speaking Canadians are living, is not, as it appears to the superficial tourist, merely a "quaint, picturesque, predominantly rural region;" it has become a center of great modern industries and restless urban masses; it has seen strikes, nationalist demonstrations, even bloodshed, although it still includes forlorn villages where the farmer lives more or less in the manner his ancestors lived in 17th century France. Are the French Canadians simply obstinate and reactionary in their attempt to resist all but inevitable changes? No, the problem is not so simple as that, the author claims, sympathetic as he is to the struggle of that minority "to maintain its cultural identity in the face of all manner of conscious and unconscious pressure to conform to the civilization of other ethnic groups and another culture." He admits that some Anglo-



Canadian officials still treat their French neighbors as though they had been conquered, not almost two hundred years ago, but that many hours ago; that some of the Anglo-Saxons—who still outnumber the "Frenchies" three to one—look down upon them as though they were an inferior race, and that very few Anglo-Canadians speak French, whereas at least every third person in the province of Quebec masters the English language.

On the other hand, Mr. Wade is not blind to the tragic shortcomings of the French minority. Does it have to permit itself to be completely dominated by the world's most reactionary clergy which generally sides with the rich against the poor? Were the French Canadians right when, in both World Wars, they refused to fight the common enemy? Did those of them—and they were, at times, quite numerous—who admired Mussolini, Hitler, Franco, and Salazar, and who vociferously advocated the creation of an independent French-Catholic "Laurentia," separated from British North America, display any great political maturity? Is "individualism" sufficient excuse for the raiding of British- and Jewish-owned shops, or for the physical maltreatment of would-be labor organizers? And what divine right can be claimed by those arrogant extremists who consider it their mission to spread the blessings of the superior French Catholic culture in the rest of the country which, in their opinion, is populated by primitive pagans?

Mr. Wade gives a good account of the history of New France from 1534 to the present day, and he convincingly states that the crucial problem of Anglo-French amity in Canada is "merely a special case of the great world problem of our times," since mankind "must learn to be equal without being identical, if it is to survive." Beyond this point, the Jewish reader may gather from this book that nationalism, justifiable *per se* as a weapon in a group's struggle for existence, becomes obnoxious as soon as it is transformed into blind chauvinism. Some of the French Canadians who were willing to let the Church do the fighting for them because some of the Jesuits and Sulpicians are the shrewdest and most unscrupulous politicians one can imagine, found out when it was almost too late that the Church had atrociously abused its clerical privileges; Liberals who sided with the reactionaries for the benefit of a common front against

"les Anglais" are beginning to realize that the strangulation of the press and the labor unions was too high a price for whatever gains the Gallic cause secured through their own deal with the Devil. There is no need on this globe for a nationalism that is nothing but reactionary, this well-written little book tells us; while every ethnic group, however weak and small, has a full right to survive as an entity, there should be no room left for such instruments of chauvinism as Gallophobia, Anglophobia, Judaeophobia, or any other dislike or aversion based on irrational fear of the unknown.

ALFRED WERNER

*The United States and Russia*, by Vera Micheles Dean. Harvard University Press. 321 pp. \$3.00.

Mrs. Vera Dean, well-known as the chief specialist on Russian Affairs for the Foreign Policy Association, offers an intelligent and conciliatory formula for the present Russian-American stalemate without the necessity of sugaring the Stalinist explanation or even leaning on the Wallace view of "monopoly capital." She takes up one by one the outstanding points of difference and shows that the Russian or American views, however divergent, may be expained without recourse to any theory of wanton aggression. She reminds us that the first American envoy to the court of Catherine the Great, Francis Dana, was not recognized because he represented a government founded on revolution. The United States, as well as the Soviet Union, she holds, sponsors a missionary ideology, American democracy, as competing with "Soviet socialism." She deplores the fact that in our fear of Russia, we have tended to ally ourselves indirectly with the forces of feudal reaction in China, Greece, Spain, Argentina, and Poland.

Without attempting to justify the Soviet way of life, Mrs. Dean makes a methodical analysis of the determinant factors in the diplomatic crisis. In her section on geography, essentially a lesson in geopolitics, she shows that the Soviets like the Czarist regime have had to solve the problem of security for a huge landlocked empire—the Heartland—cut off from the rest of the world because of the lack (until recently) of ice-free ports. Czar and Commissar have had to work for outlets at the Manchurian border and

in the Baltic Sea. Today the Soviets have attained part of their objective by the annexation of essential Far Eastern areas, but have failed to make headway in recovering former Czarist areas and "spheres of influence" from Turkey and Iran. She is rebuilding the eastern European bastion of Poland and the Balkans, as did the Czar, against the recurrent threat of invasion from the West. This concept of strategy, once condemned by Lenin and Trotsky as capitalist imperialism, has been taken over by the realistic Russians. Mrs. Dean points out that the huge Russian land mass is at a disadvantage against the great naval powers such as the United States and Britain because of the persistent problem of adequate internal transportation, particularly in rail movement. Given Russia's almost pathological suspicion of American and British designs—and our suspicions, it must be added, are scarcely less than hers today—her frantic efforts to build an impregnable defense can be explained without recourse to charges of Napoleonic ambitions.

Although Mrs. Dean finds little to offset the fact that the Russian system is based on police terrorism and a denial of elementary civil liberties, she points out the Russian achievement in substituting a toleration for cultural diversity among her 180 nationalities for the brutal "Russification" methods of the Czars. She also gives credit to the margin of local, social and economic expression permitted this recently-feudalized people within the framework of Sovietism. The world has always been a "House-divided" and Americans should be the last people to show intolerance of social and economic experimentation. Russia, she reminds us, was never a capitalist country in our sense, and the present regime, while intolerable to any thoughtful Westerner, shows some advance over its predecessor.

One very interesting point is made that should be mulled over by those who think of Russia as in the vanguard of a great world emancipating movement. "The Russians," she writes, "when tested by the standards of Western Civilization, appear reactionary in their adherence to political authoritarianism at home and in their insistence on strong-arm nationalist methods abroad." A very effective quotation is given from an interview of the journalist, Richard Lauterbach, with a Soviet intellectual, who recently

observed, "There is a crisis in the Soviet Union. Not a crisis of economics, you will have that I think. Ours is chiefly a crisis of the spirit. There is a great evidence that the well springs of creative energy which every social earthquake releases are dangerously close to drying up. . . . We are so weary. The slogans are weary. The words seem to have lost their life. Even the new banners look old and tired. But the people want something new."

The author is weakest when she offers a solution beyond the Byrnes formula of "patience and firmness." She calls for a middle way along the lines originally suggested by Secretary Marshall in China, eschewing extremism on the right or left and refusing to abet a reactionary regime. But where are these liberals with whom we must work in the Far East? One can understand her recommendation to work with the new "center" of Socialists, Christian Socialists of the Gasperi type, and Laborites, but these groups have been weakened in Eastern Europe by strong-arm Communists and hardly exist in force in Asia. She favors the Marshall Plan but insists that we should work within an international agency like the UN, disregarding our previous difficulties with UNRRA. Although critical of Soviet opposition to the Baruch plan of atomic control, she finds it not much different from our own insistence on veto power in the UN and attempts to bypass the Security Council.

One wonders whether in her efforts to "understand" Russia, she has not used the "you, too" kind of logic up to a point where appeasement takes on a dangerous if not immoral form. Mrs. Dean does not realize that Russia, rather than the United States, continues to operate along a kind of "cultural lag" appropriate to a pre-atomic age rather than the Age of Damocles we live in. Without the Baruch plan, Russo-American suspicions will inevitably mount and the results are easily forecast. No amount of "understanding Russia" will dissipate the basic fear of extinction which the uncontrolled atom bomb offers the people of the world. Because the Russians have imbibed a doctrinal distrust of "capitalists," even in the form of UN, she cannot permit international inspection by any committee within her borders; thus she offers policing only by each nation concerned—a comforting substitute!

While Mrs. Dean is correct in reminding us of our own international shortcomings, she is guilty of a serious error in giving the impression that responsibility is about equally divided. If this is so, what concession can the United States make to satisfy Russia's demands and yet give us and the rest of the democratic nations the security we need against mass suicide? It is more than doubtful that many of Mrs. Dean's suggestions will satisfy either Russia or the West.

HARVEY WISH

*Critics and Crusaders: A Century of American Protest*, by Charles A. Madison. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1948. 572 pp. \$3.50.

Mr. Madison in his *Critics and Crusaders* considers six groups of reformers who have profoundly influenced American life and thought during the last hundred years: the Abolitionists, the Utopians, the Anarchists, the Dissident Economists, the Militant Liberals, and the Socialists. Of each group he selects three representative figures for a brief biographical sketch which stresses in each instance the man's ideas. He also prefaces each section with an illuminating discussion of the background from which these notable Americans sprang.

These men—and women, for there are two women, Margaret Fuller and Emma Goldman, whose lives and contributions are told—are of unequal distinction and memorableness. Benjamin R. Tucker, Albert Brisbane, Daniel De Leon, and Randolph Bourne are not names likely to be long remembered. Yet all alike were dedicated to the improvement of American life, to the realization of that dream which is implicit in the philosophy of democracy. It is well to remember these men and women and their leavening influence in American life. Abused and condemned in their day, most of them, and even martyred, they appear in retrospect among the best fruits of the American way of life. They contributed to the enduring stream of thought which is the reality of civilization, a stream on whose surface are borne the politicians, warriors, and industrial exploiters who are no more than flotsam in time's perspective.

Had our educators vision, a book such as this would be on the reading lists of high school students, replacing some vol-

ume which preaches the religion of success. For these were all in the deepest sense successful men and women whatever their worldly obloquy and failure. One grateful student recalls a high school principal of nearly fifty years ago who put into his hands Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, with what subsequent influence on his social thinking it is now impossible for him to evaluate. Yet he knows that it was great. It would be well if more young Americans could be similarly inspired to criticism of our society and stimulated to work for its betterment.

Mr. Madison's biographies and introductory sketches are excellent. He understands the value of these crusaders to American life and thought however visionary and impractical some of them were. Society owes whatever advancement it has achieved throughout the whole of human history to men such as these.

C. H. GRABO

*Freud: His Life and Mind*, by Helen Walker Puner. Howell, Soskin. 360 pp. \$4.00.

This book tells the story of Freud's life, from the time of his birth to the year of his exile and his death in London. The author stresses the element of anti-Semitism that prevailed in Austria, the snubs and humiliations inflicted on the Jews. To offset their feeling that they were not wanted, the Jews developed a cult of rationalism. And Freud breathed in this atmosphere of faith in mechanical causation and scientific method, as opposed to the tradition of Judaism. According to the author, this generated a conflict in his character, which shaped his life and colored the substance of his work. Freud has told us of his reaction to the trauma of anti-Semitic rejection; he knew what it meant to belong to an alien, despised race, but his impulse was always to fight back. Refusing to acknowledge that he was in any sense inferior, he devoted himself with greater intensity to his professional career, determined to transform his handicap into a source of strength.

Then the science of psychoanalysis came to birth. As its founder, Freud encountered envenomed hostility not only because his views were original and iconoclastic but also because he was a Jew. This only served to render him more stubborn, so that in time he developed a messianic streak. Enmity and rejection

confirmed him in his determination to convince the world of his exceptional greatness. And Mrs. Puner is inclined to agree with Freud that it was no chance that the first psychoanalyst was a Jew. Because he is driven in upon himself, the Jew must find sustenance in the world of the spirit. This is a good example of hindsight. By the same token, the Negroes, also victims of persecution, should in time become the Galileos and Colum-buses of the inner world.

In the beginning, Freud had planned to invest Jung with supreme power at the second congress of psychoanalysts at Nuremberg in 1910, because he wanted a Gentile, not a Jew, to hold the reins of office. Only in that way could the movement prosper and the taint of Jewishness be removed. Not that Freud ever consciously repudiated his Jewishness. On the contrary, the suffering he endured led him to make a decision from which he never swerved: namely, to remain a Jew as his parents had been, to be identified with the body of Jewry. Even the proud rebel had to have some group to which he belonged. He joined the B'nai B'rith, "for I myself was a Jew, and it always seemed to me not only shameful but downright senseless to deny it." But his affiliation with this organization was not an act of religious faith or a sign of spiritual conversion. For Freud never abandoned his skeptical, rationalist attitude toward religion; he had never been brought up to follow the rituals and ceremonies of orthodox Judaism and did not demand such observances on the part of his children. But whereas he educated his children to regard themselves as Jews, as a psychoanalyst he was helping to destroy the foundations of religion.

Mrs. Puner has not only gathered and coordinated the autobiographical data and personal revelations of Freud, in the form of dreams and confessions, into a unified account of his life and work; she also applies what she believes is a master key that will unlock the secrets of Freud's mind, the conflicts and repressions that raged within him. What she does is to turn the weapons of Freudianism against the founder of psychoanalysis, and the results are extremely disturbing. Freud, it is charged, suffered from ambivalence of feeling toward the humble, undistinguished Jew who had fathered him. This ambivalence was carried over

in his attitude toward Judaism. Consciously he remained a Jew all his life, but unconsciously, in his dreams and psychoanalytic writings, he betrayed a desire to go to Rome and become a Roman Catholic. Just before his irrevocable break with the Freudian circle—he was expelled for his heresies—Alfred Adler cried out in passion: "Let us investigate the psychoanalytic method and its investigators by means of psychoanalysis—if it is, after all, so infallible a tool as you claim it to be!" This is precisely what Mrs. Puner attempts to do, though she tries hard to be a sympathetic critic and recognizes the greatness and permanence of Freud's clinical contributions.

There was a deep split in Freud's character. He had been brought up on German culture, and intellectually he had always looked upon himself as a German until the growth of anti-Semitism forced him to reconsider his position. On the one hand, Judaism represented degradation and defeat, the religion which had earned him obloquy and bitter opposition. On the other, he had openly aligned himself with the Jews of his community. What, then, did religion represent? The force of the irrational! Hence it must be explored, flooded with the light of reason. He came to the conclusion that the concept of a personal God was nothing more than a substitute father image. Now how much truth is there in the contention that Freud's views on religion were connected with the unconscious hatred he bore his father, the unconscious hatred he felt for Judaism, even though consciously he aligned himself with it? For Christianity, too, which had made him a scapegoat, was the object of his hatred. "But he also," adds Mrs. Puner, "like every Jew who has been set apart, yearned unconsciously to become a part of their world."

This constitutes the most dubious section of the book—hoisting Freud with his own petard, exposing the nakedness and contradictions of his own unconscious motivations. Why assume that his interest in Roman architecture, statuary, art, and antiquity was a masked expression of his unconscious urge to identify himself with the Roman Catholic Church? After all, he attacked the religious impulse in *Totem and Taboo*. But this contradiction can also be explained by the convenient principle of ambivalence. Now this business of interpreting Freud's secret wishes and the significance of his recorded



dreams and of attributing to him a yearning to adopt Christianity is not only unmitigated nonsense but an unmitigated nuisance. There is no way of proving or disproving such fantastic conjectures. Freud, if we judge him strictly by his actions, held back consistently from the path of assimilation.

It is not at all surprising that Freud, the discoverer of psychoanalysis and the explorer of the terra incognita of the unconscious, was himself full of contradictions and conflicts. Who that is human is without them? But to condemn his researches on the life of Moses and his book, *Moses and Monotheism*, as if he were guilty of a kind of treason against Judaism is utterly to fail to understand the significance of his method and his scientific temper. Why speculate gratuitously that his conclusion that Moses was not a Jew represents a species of revenge? Why argue that this work is the fulfilment of an irrational impulse, a retreat from the life of reason? Why assume that, in rejecting the Jewish God, Freud was repudiating not only Judaism but his father as well? This is childish reasoning. This use of psychoanalytic methods to impugn a writer's motives is absurd in the extreme, a demonstration devoid of proof. It destroys the very possibility of arriving at objective truth. If psychoanalysis is a science, it must be criticized according to scientific, not subjective, standards.

Mrs. Puner industriously set herself to the task of gathering the source material which lies scattered through Freud's writings, particularly in *The History of the Psychoanalytic Movement*, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, and *An Autobiography*, and presenting it in the form of a straightforward, connected account in terms that even the layman can understand. She has done more, however, than tell the story of his life; she has ventured, as we have indicated, to psychoanalyze "the Master." She marshals her material masterfully and dramatically, developing each source of conflict, each ambivalence in Freud's nature, following his career step by step, and using the materials provided by his colleagues, contemporaries, enemies, and disciples to round out her story. Even if some of her psychoanalytic deductions are highly questionable, this is certainly a provocative and much-needed volume.

CHARLES I. GLICKSBERG

*The Foreign Affairs Reader*, by Hamilton Fish Armstrong. Published for the Council on Foreign Relations by Harper and Brothers, New York and London. 1947. VIII+492 pp. \$5.00.

The science of killing and self-defense in war is called *strategy*, and the old Greeks and Romans were as familiar with this discipline as the Germans during the time of Clausewitz or the French in the time of Vauban or of Napoleon. The science of peace has not been as well developed. The *Foreign Affairs Reader* is a major contribution to the science of peace.

It will serve as an excellent sourcebook on peacemaking and for the understanding of international relations. It is more than a book, for it is a library in one volume which presents works by some of the acutest political commentators of our day—with the added merit of the wise comments of Hamilton Fish Armstrong, the editor. The whole, essentially a collection of the most significant articles published in *Foreign Affairs* since 1923, has been well integrated into an interesting and enlightening volume.

In an introductory chapter by Elihu Root, the Secretary of State under Theodore Roosevelt, the reader will find the essentials of a democratic foreign policy. "We have learned," writes Elihu Root, "that war is essentially a popular business. . . . There is a general conviction that there has been something wrong about the conduct of diplomacy under which peoples have so often found themselves embarked in war without intending it and without wishing for it and there is a strong desire to stop that sort of thing. . . . That is, that democracy which is undertaking to direct the business of diplomacy shall learn the business. The controlling democracy must acquire a knowledge of the fundamental and essential facts and principles upon which the relations of nations depend." These were words written in the twenties, and they are more significant today than they were then.

I had the same impression when I read the wise words of Thomas G. Masaryk in his "Reflections on the Question of War Guilt." At a time when many professors of history were trying to prove that Germany had no responsibility for the First World War, and at a time when this point of view began to make head-

way, Thomas Masaryk, with wisdom and clarity, showed in a short philosophical and historical essay the direct connection between German militarism and the First World War. Moreover, his chapter was, and still is, a strong warning to the world. "The soldier, the Prussian officer was for the Germans the standard of social organisation, in fact of the organisation of the world. The soldier and war became institutions. . . ." And further, "The character of the war depends on the character of the soldiers. If the war, as the pacifists assure us, let loose all the evil forces such as hate, ill-will and bellicosity, then these qualities did not arise only in war, but were characteristic of the people before the war; the devils of the year 1914 were not the angels of 1913. . . ." This, was equally true in 1939 as it was in 1914. Just as the mice followed the piper of Hamelin, so did the majority of Germans follow the flute of Hitler and of Goebbels.

*The Foreign Affairs Reader* also includes articles by Bukharin, Radek, and Trotsky which give the impression that they were written for foreign consumption. "We don't want a single bit of foreign land," cries Stalin from the pages of an article by Radek. But about the coming World War II he writes: "Irrespectively what might be the course of the war and who might be responsible for its origins, the only victor that would emerge from it would be the Soviet Union. . . ." Bukharin, executed during the purges, debates the issue of racism and imperialism. And despite the warnings of the dangers of imperialism, the fact remains that today the Soviet Union has embarked on a similar dangerous road of expansion.

Chapter after chapter, the reading of this valuable symposium brings us into the realm of controversy and discussion. Sometimes, when we read articles such as the one Mussolini has contributed, we cannot refrain from commenting with Elihu Root that there really was something basically wrong with European diplomacy.

The chapter titles and the names of the authors will give to the reader an index to the wealth and wide range of the problems discussed in this volume:

Elihu Root, "A Requisite for Success of Popular Diplomacy"; Thomas G. Masaryk, "Reflections on the Question of War Guilt"; G. Gentile, "The Philo-

sophic Basis of Fascism"; Harold J. Laski, "Lenin and Mussolini"; Philip Kerr, "From Empire to Commonwealth"; W. R. B. DuBois, "Worlds of Color"; Jules Cambon, "The Permanent Basis of French Foreign Policy"; Viscount Grey of Fal-lodon, "Freedom of the Seas"; E. F. Gay, "The Great Depression"; N. D. Baker, "The New Spirit and its Critics"; K. Radek, "The Basis of Soviet Foreign Policy"; N. Bukharin, "Imperialism and Communism"; G. Stolper, "Politics vs. Economics"; L. Trotsky, "Nationalism and Economic Life"; R. Wakatsuki, "The Aims of Japan"; A. L. Lowell, "The Evolution of Democracy"; D. Thompson, "The Problem Child of Europe"; M. Hoden, "Europe Without League"; E. Staley, "The Myth of the Continents"; J. Benda, "Pacifism and Democracy"; G. Crowther, "Freedom and Control"; Wendell L. Wilkie, "Our Sovereignty: Shall We Use It"; H. J. Mackinder, "The Round World and Winning the Peace"; A. Geraud, "Diplomacy, Old and New"; John Foster Dulles, "The General Assembly"; I. Bowman, "The Strategy of Territorial Decisions"; Henry L. Stimson, "The Nuremberg Trial"; X, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct"; Benedetto Croce, "On Liberty."

*The Foreign Affairs Reader* is a symposium of a great variety of views and provides stimulating reading for those who look for guidance in the world of international relations. FELIKS GROSS

---

*The Meaning of Treason*, by Rebecca West. The Viking Press. 307 pp. \$3.50.

This is one of the most brilliant and useful books that has yet come out of our grim experiences in World War II. At the same time, it is one of the most ominous in its vague foreshadowings of the treasons, treachery, baseness, and stratagems that are to come if the next world war is to be, as feared, a struggle between the Communist and anti-Communist empires.

Rebecca West has been called the best reporter of our times, and in this book there is marvelous evidence of her supreme skill as a reporter. Her accounts of the trials of such malodorous or pathetic British traitors as William Joyce ("Lord Haw-Haw"), John Amery, Purdy, Baillie-Stewart, Stoker Rose, and others are unforgettable as narratives, delineat-

tions of character, explanations of motives. We get the essential facts, and more. We learn why men betray their countries and peoples and we get insight into the personal and national consequences of such misdeeds. Rebecca West travels back and forth between the concrete and the abstract with the greatest of ease. She has clarity of thought and lucidity of style; at the same time she is supersubtle and her words suggest nuances. One reads her book because it deals with an increasingly important subject. One remembers it because it gives classic expression to its basic ideas.

Rebecca West finds that the traitors are of three strains. Far the worst to her are the revolutionaries of either the right or the left. Of this group was William Joyce, who, because of his acceptance of Nazism, mocked over the air at the sufferings of his own British people when Nazi bombs were dropped on them. Of the same group was Dr. Allan Nunn May, the nuclear physicist who, out of his Communist faith, betrayed atomic secrets to the Russians.

Then there was the insane root, men, like John Amery, who betray their countries because of a psychotic hatred of the rules of life and loyalty. Amery, in the end, threw away his life with a plea of guilty, knowing that for high treason only the death penalty is permitted under British law. So this wild and untameable elder son of a renowned leader of British politics added one more bizarre chapter to a life that was already garish and nightmarish.

Rebecca West tells of the children among the traitors, young in years, childish in thought, treacherous in an irresponsible and puerile fashion. These children were often without malice. They simply wanted the petty rewards, the sweetmeats, the temptor was offering.

Rebecca West sums up the tragic story in unforgettable language. Her words should be read as a warning for the warding off of the still more tragic days that are to come. "As a divorce sharply recalls what a happy marriage should be," she says, "so the treachery of these men recalled what a nation should be; a shelter where all talents are generously recognized, all forgivable oddities forgiven, all viciousness quietly frustrated, and those who lack talent honoured for equivalent contributions of graciousness.

Each of these men was as dependent on the good opinion of others as one is oneself; they needed a nation which was also a hearth. It was sad to see them, chilled to the bones of their souls, because the intellectual leaders of their time had professed a philosophy which was scarcely more than a lapse of memory, and had forgotten, among much else, that a hearth gives out warmth."

If America is not to have traitors in its days of trial, then it is high time that we take up the task once more of securing social justice for all, meaning by that bread and more for all mouths, clothes and more for all bodies, shelter and more for all souls, and the opportunities and the climate for personal adjustments and satisfactions, all this and more without regard to color, creed, sex, or status. Otherwise there may be sadder volumes than this one written about America.

ELMER GERTZ

*The Jew In American Sports*, by Harold U. Ribalow. Bloch Publishing Company. 288 pp. \$3.00.

If need there be to belabor the thesis that the Jew as a man of "peace" excels but in counting houses and in intellectual pursuits Mr. Ribalow, in his book, poses and advances a contrary view both spiritedly and impressively. The author traces the deeds and feats of Jewish champions and near champions from the days of the gay nineties—Joe Choynsky the prize-fighter—until today—the hey-days of a Hank Greenberg, baseball's wonder man. More than twenty five notables in the fields of boxing, baseball, basketball, football, golf, chess, hockey, and soccer comprise Ribalow's list. Here is even a "bull-fighter from Flatbush," Sidney Franklin, a thin, studious Jewish boy from Brooklyn, a Columbia University student, who achieved fame and made a fortune as a matador of Mexico and Spain.

Always it was, in the telling of the author—and he quotes chapter and verse from the accounts of various events "on the spot" by competent reporters—that the Jew in the ring and in the field, as a prize-fighter of the stature of a Benny Leonard, Barney Ross, Al Singer and others—showed a stout heart, brilliant generalship, great courage and that he won or lost as it befits a sportsman or a champion.

Mr. Ribalow notes that managers of great baseball teams have always sought and to this day, seek baseball players of Jewish extraction. The reason for this predilection is, of course the "box-office" appeal—Jews as customers flock to cheer "their own." The author contends that no discrimination against Jew persists either with management or, with the sports fan in American cities. A Sid Luckman, Marshall Goldberg, or a Benny Friedman is cheered or booed on the basis of individual performance rather than on "racial" lines.

Mr. Ribalow's is an engaging lively volume, a useful footnote for the sociologist and, per se, a book to read and re-read for skillfully choosen record of exploits of American heroes in various fields of sports endeavor.

BENJAMIN WEINTROUB

*The Neon Wilderness*, by Nelson Algren.  
Doubleday & Co. 286 pp. \$2.50.

With his first novel *Somebody In Boots* Nelson Algren arose gigantically upon the horizon. The story was crude and not always plausibly told, yet one felt that the author had reserves of enormous power and one would feel their full effect when he had mastered his medium. His second book, *Never Come Morning*, was a marked lapse from the first, giving one the impression of hasty writing and being so better than others of its genre; whatever vigor was inherent in the story dissipated itself in the novel's loosely built structure. It is in *The Neon Wilderness* that he reaches on occasions his full stature as a writer.

It was at a small gathering of friends that I first came on the book. In a lull that fell upon the gaiety, someone took up the book and began reading from it the story called *The Face On The Bar-room Floor*. Then slowly the atmosphere of the room changed. The lights grew dim, the mists of the pit began to rise; faces cruel, snarl-mouthed, pavement-grey, began to float through the fog, to assume evil bodies and to enact their parts in a drama of flesh-crawling horror. The reading ended in complete silence. We had no more heart for jokes and for laughter. An evil gloom hung about us and was not to be dispelled. The creatures of the pit had arisen into the scene of our merriment, freezing the laughter

on our lips, sickening our souls, murdering our joy.

And whoever reads this book, unless he has become as stony as the grim city walls among which he moves, will know that there can be no laughter in the world while such conditions prevail and such creatures arise from them. And in this book Nelson Algren parades them all—the hopheads, the jackrollers, the pimps, the whores, rapists, the murderers—all the slum-spawn and pavement-bred, warped out of all humanity and transmogrified into things of night and terror. Here you will meet them in all their haunts, slobbering over their drinks in dim squalid saloons; bending over dice tables in befogged rooms; lining up under the ghastly and pitiless light of police-station showups; lying asprawl in the foul traps of their lonely cubicles, with the bloody light of the neon recurrently bringing their pasty faces out of darkness. You will hear too their voices, coming out of mouths twisting as in pain—voices drunk-hoarse or coldly murderous, or dulled with an immeasurable hopelessness. And you will have glimpses of the places where they pullulate—the dark alleys of night, the dreary stretches of broken pavement lined by rotting structures—the great fetid areas of decay.

Here is the detritus of an industrial city; this the pit on which the metropolis is built. The violences and corruption dutifully recorded in the daily papers show how the filth splashes up to touch and rot all the strata of society. In the story mentioned, Nelson Algren has taken an episode that might have been buried with brief mention in a newspaper and transmuted it into art. One would have to ransack a whole library to find another short story with such concentration of pity and terror. The story appears appropriately towards the middle of the book, to which other stories, like *The Captain Has Bad Dreams* and *How The Devil Came To Division Street*, seem to mount terribly to a crescendo of brutality, and from which stories following, like *Million-Dollar Brainstorm* and *Design For Departure* seem to sink on a descending scale into the nightmarish worlds of psychosis.

In this perhaps arbitrary scheme of the book there are a few dissonances. A few stories, like those on the war, do not belong in this arrangement and seem to



be alien to the book's very title. One of these tales, *That's The Way It's Always Been*, shows a weakness against which the angry writer must guard himself. Here Nelson Algren lets his anger run away from the control and discipline of his art—even into name-calling, so that he introduces a colonel with such phrases "The Man Without Any Brains," "This Kansas abortionist," etc. This is especially regrettable in this story, since it packs more material and is obviously more intensely felt than any of the three war stories. The ironic humor in which he has cast *Poor Man's Pennies* is at odds with the unrelieved tragic quality with which he has invested most effectively other stories of the city. This might not be a fault if he were at ease in this medium, but Nelson Algren is no ironic

humorist: his material affects him too intensely. He is instead a writer of great anger, great bitterness, great compassion, who has made the cause of the rejected and despised his own.

Nevertheless, despite such lapses, Nelson Algren reaches in this book his greatest height. He now has the prodigious task of learning to sustain it. Let him take as his model *The Face On The Barroom Floor*. Let him write a full novel of equal economy of style, choosing as in this short story only the weighted word and seeing that every chosen word contributes to the dominant mood. If he writes such a novel—and he gives every reason to believe he can—there is hardly a writer living who will be able to touch it.

SAMUEL MOSS

The protection of civil rights begins with the mutual respect for the rights of others which all of us should practice in our daily lives. Through organizations in every community in all parts of the country we must continue to develop practical and workable arrangements for the achieving of greater tolerance and brotherhood.

The protection of civil rights is the duty of every government which derives its powers from the consent of the people. This is equally true of local, state, and national governments. There is much that the states can and should do at this time to extend their protection of civil

rights. Wherever the law enforcement measures of State and local governments are inadequate to discharge this primary function of government, these measures should be strengthened and improved.

The Federal Government has a clear duty to see that constitutional guarantees of individual liberties and of equal protection under the laws are not denied or abridged anywhere in our Union. That duty is shared by all three branches of the Government, but it can be fulfilled only if Congress enacts modern, comprehensive civil rights laws, adequate to the needs of the day, and demonstrating our continuing faith in the free way of life.

PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN: Message on Civil Rights



*At The Ark*

N. P. STEINBERG

... and . . a happy new year

**PAUL G. ANNES**

The Jew is a symbol—a symbol of man's will to freedom. His survival is a vital contribution to the democratic process in the world.

**SAMUEL L. ANTONOW**

*President, Decalogue Society of Lawyers*

Let us, a free people, maintain constant vigil so that the forces of the dark never emerge to threaten mankind.

**COL. JACOB M. ARVEY**

Respect for law and love for justice have been the characteristics of the Jewish people from time immemorial.

**JACOB M. BRAUDE**

*Judge, Municipal Court*

So that the young who paid the supreme price may not have died in vain, let us be steadfast in the defense of the ideals for which they have died.

**ADOLPH BRAUN**

It is our duty as free Americans to express ourselves, wherever we are against prejudice, for righteousness, for decency and for understanding.

**MAX BRESSLER**

The defense of democracy is the defense of Jewish principles, of social justice and ethical living.

**HENRY L. BURMAN, Master in Chancery**

Religion is a commitment to the highest moral and spiritual values. It is in the practice of those commitments that we assert ourselves.

**SAMUEL BYRON**

It should be remembered that Jewry, the world over, will be the proud beneficiaries of Israel's struggle for a nationhood.

**JOHN H. CHATZ**

There can be no mitigating circumstance for those wholly impervious to Israel's plea for help.

**SAMUEL DIAMOND**

"We gave in pity . . . now we give with pride"—to the children of Israel fighting for a homeland.

**ARTHUR X. ELROD**

*County Commissioner*

The best interests of humanity require our incessant concern with problems of the underprivileged and the needy.

**SAMUEL B. EPSTEIN**

*Judge, Superior Court, Cook County*

High moral principles is the only safe-guide, the only torch to light man's way amidst darkness and obstruction.

**HYMAN FELDMAN**

Loyalty to one's ideals, self, and friends makes for a loftiest meaning of life.

**JACOB L. FRIEDMAN**

*Trustee, Sanitary District*

No people, said Lincoln, can exist half slave and half free. What is true of a nation is true, also, of the world.

**MICHAEL A. GERRARD**

We must strive for the advance of freedom and equality, not only for our own people, but for mankind as a whole.

**JACK GOLDBERG**

In the story of mankind the persecution of the Jew ran always parallel with evil designs upon the freedom of the individual.

**ALEX M. GOLMAN**

May the builders of Palestine soon realize their fondest hopes and dreams.

**A. PAUL HOLLEB**

A united Israel the world over is the surest guarantee of success for our fighting brethren in Palestine.

**MICHAEL L. IGOE**

*Judge, U. S. District Court*

Responsible communal endeavor is always a prerequisite of sound American citizenship.

**HARRY A. ISEBERG**

Jewish solidarity with the cause of freedom stems from the age old struggle of the people of Israel for the rights of man.

**S. JESMER**

May deep and abiding faith in our institutions be forever the guiding principles of the Forum policies.

**DAVID A. KLEIN**

The building and the preservation of a decent and lawful community is indispensable for man's progress.

**LOUIS A. KLEIN**

Justice to Israel and freedom for Israel should be the concern of the righteous and the just.

## . . . and . . . a happy new year

**DR. N. D. LIEBERFARB**

May those whose sacred task it is to heal the wounds of a post-war world possess the wisdom of sages and the insight of prophets.

**JOSEPH LIPSHUTZ**

May the FORUM persist in championing precepts of culture and find cause in the future to rejoice in man's progress.

**HERBERT N. MAGIDA**

No issue today transcends in burning immediacy the problems before the United Nations—that of a lasting and a durable peace among all the peoples on earth.

**HARRY MARCUS**

In culture and in enlightenment lies the promise of a better tomorrow. Let us try for such an end.

**A. J. MINKUS, President, Chicago Hias**

The heroic struggle of our brethren in Palestine should inspire us to aid them to the utmost of our abilities.

**OSCAR M. NUDELMAN**

In culture and in enlightenment lies the promise of a better tomorrow. May we hasten that day.

**BERNARD K. OFFENBERG**

The troublesome post-war years abroad serve as proof to us that ours is the best system of government on earth.

**MORRIS L. RAUER**

The secret of the survival of the Jew lies in his strict observance of Jewish traditions.

**WM. J. ROBINSON**

The precepts of true democracy are identical with the essence of Judaism.

**HAROLD ROSENBERG**

Only as Anti-Semitism ceases to exist and like a belief in witches, becomes extinct beyond all possibility of revival can we justly call ourselves civilized beings.

**A. J. SABATH**

*Congressman, Fifth District*

In these strenuous times the magnificent morale of the American people stems from an unshakable conviction that our way of life is best.

**OSCAR SALENGER, Los Angeles, Cal.**

Democracy is more than a creed, its axioms require translations into living. Therein lies its very meaning and essence.

**BENJAMIN P. SAX**

We need to have the feeling and the imagination to envision a better world for all of us and we need the will to implement the plan with the deed.

**GEORGE D. SAX, Chairman of the Board, Exchange National Bank**

From the days of Moses the greatest leaders of Jewry have always championed the brotherhood of men and the welfare of all peoples. Let us live up to our heritage.

**MEYER SCHUMAN, Los Angeles, Cal.**

Since the founding of this Republic the term "American" has stood for, and will continue to stand throughout the world—a synonym for justice and righteousness.

**WILLIAM M. SHAPIRO**

*Los Angeles, California*

May it be our destiny to record in the ensuing year happier days for Kol Yisroel and all the peoples on earth.

**LAWRENCE G. SHENDER**

It is not the fear of the Atomic bomb but man's own conscience that must be the deciding factor in determining a better world.

**DAVID F. SILVERZWEIG**

In our concern with the problems of our fellow men we discharge one of the primary duties of free Americans.

**ISIDORE SPINNER**

We should shirk no burden the carrying of which would lighten the task of those who would help our stricken brethren overseas.

**I. B. URY**

For a true believer in a decent world the battleground is everywhere where the ideals of freedom are in jeopardy.

**JACOB WEINBERG**

The denial of civil rights to any man is an impairment of our own rights, and we must strive vigilantly to protect the rights of all.



